

(2) Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater decisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?

(3) Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all individual citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing the speeches, votes, and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying the recommendations of an organization, a political party, or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what it proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary, and paternalistic in conception. With the clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or a cause on the pretext that it is liberal when in fact it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this Republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each individual citizen. We have been happily moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the Preamble to our Constitution. We have been endeavoring to extend the vote to all our citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so that every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

But, the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it. Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever seen but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate—or perhaps less prudent—countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom which provides for the most liberal government in the world, one in which the wishes, the desires, and the ideals of the people can predominate. The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place. Let us not reduce that light of liberty to a mere smudgepot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require a subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government. Let us examine each new proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or the mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal of 1962. If he is true to the liberal traditions of the past, the liberal heritage which is his as an American, he can not embrace concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Ephesians 3: 16: That He would grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man.*

Almighty God, during this Lenten season may we become richer in the culture of our souls and stronger in gaining the mastery over every insurgent impulse, every inordinate desire, and every self-indulgent habit.

May we daily cultivate a more intimate and radiant fellowship with the spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee who went about doing good and who called upon His followers to share their strength with the weak, their sympathy with the sorrowing, their substance with the poor, and to give their hearts to God.

Inspire us to live among our fellow men as messengers of helpfulness whose minds and hearts are impervious to the spirit of self-seeking and self-glory but who are defining and interpreting life in terms of its usefulness and its value in contributing to the building of Thy kingdom and the blessedness of all mankind.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1963, was read and approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, of February 27, 1963, on House Joint Resolution 249, I am recorded as being absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LABOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that it was just 50 years ago that President Taft signed into law the bill creating a new Department of Labor.

Thereby the concern of America for its working men and women was evidenced and in the ensuing years of expanding industrialization the wisdom of having the Government interest itself in workers and working conditions has been fully demonstrated.

Under free labor and a free system of enterprise, and under also our great Constitution and Bill of Rights, this Nation has been producing 35 percent of the world's goods through the organized effort of only 6 percent of the world's population.

This achievement has been possible because of our system of economic freedom and the wage and profit incentives under it during the past half century.

I want to express my appreciation of the Department of Labor and extend this tribute to the workers of America who look to this Department to oversee their interests and basic rights.

### DISARMAMENT AGENCY DEPUTY'S STATEMENT IS BLUEPRINT FOR SELF-MUTILATION

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, speaks for himself, William G. Foster, the Agency's Administrator, and for the President. His statement today on the administration's test ban position in answer to Senator Dodd's recent speech is shocking and tragic.

Mr. Fisher has at last revealed the Kennedy administration's blueprint for an American strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation.

Fisher's claim that "the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way" by clandestine Soviet test cheating flies in the face of repeated statements to the contrary by several U.S. experts in the actual making of nuclear weapons.

More than that, however, it completely undercuts any reason for U.S. demands for an adequate control system in any test ban treaty. Why should such machinery to detect and verify cheating be included in a treaty if the contention is

correct that no significant progress could be made while the Soviets test clandestinely and we test not at all? The administration's position, therefore, must now be that detection and inspection machinery need no longer be insisted upon.

Fisher's words must be a great aid and comfort to the Kremlin. They signal it to sit tight while the Americans cave in on the test ban talks. He has ratified the long-suspected fact that bargaining and negotiation have been replaced by kowtow and concession on the U.S. side of the Geneva conference table.

I intend to issue a series of point-by-point exposures of the fatally dangerous Foster-Fisher fallacies. These gentlemen try to make some kind of meaningful distinction between surrender to Communist objectives on the installment plan and outright relinquishment of the world to Communist domination. There is no such distinction and I do not believe the American people can be sold the bill of goods that there is.

Also I am pressing my request that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hold exhaustive hearings on nontechnical as well as technical factors involved in the test ban.

#### RESUMPTION OF PUBLICATION OF NEW YORK POST

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that in the city of New York there were seven newspapers which were not publishing; that of that number, three had voluntarily ceased publication in accordance with a publishers' agreement and were not under strike. I am delighted to report to the House that the publisher of the New York Post, Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, announced that she would start today to publish the New York Post again. I commend her and believe that this should help to resolve the present labor dispute.

#### JOINT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the CIA is fast becoming the subject of many questions asked in the Congress and in this Nation. The intense interest of the American public in following the handling of the Cuban situation has claimed close attention to the details surrounding U.S. actions in Cuba. The questions are becoming more precise in nature every day. However, such

questioning should be above partisan approach but valid questioning of the CIA and other intelligence operations of the U.S. Government is in order.

The major area of concern lies in determining just how far the CIA may have strayed from the intent of Congress; what powers and authority has the CIA acquired or not fulfilled since it was originally established by act of Congress in 1947?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the establishment of a joint watchdog committee composed of members of both political parties, from both the House and the Senate, to oversee the activities of the CIA as well as the other intelligence operations of the Government. I urge the Members of both the House and the Senate to join in the effort to establish this joint watchdog committee for the security of our Nation.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recognition of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor in the executive department, I have noted an unfortunate failure to recognize the significance of the part played by the late William Howard Taft, 27th President of the United States, who on March 4, 1913, at the very close of his term as President signed the bill establishing the Department of Labor.

It was during the administration of William Howard Taft that important progress was made by the American Federation of Labor, which had more than 1,500,000 members in 1910 and which was composed largely of trade unionists who supported Taft and who resisted with him efforts to wreck the union movement threatened by the expansion of the radical International Workers of the World.

President Taft's role is frequently misinterpreted and often deliberately distorted. During his administration there was greater progress in the elimination of monopoly and restraints of trade than during any prior administration. He proposed and Congress passed the Mann-Elkins Act of 1910 enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, established postal savings banks and the parcel post system, and authorized a National Health Bureau and Federal Children's Bureau. By Executive order he extended the merit system in the Postal Department and in the consular and diplomatic services.

On this day when the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor is being celebrated, full recognition should be given to the man whose pen converted this dream into the permanent fabric of our Nation.

I am pleased to join with my esteemed colleague from Ohio, Congressman ROBERT A. TAFT, JR., in this timely recognition of the establishment of the Department of Labor, in connection with which his grandfather, the late William Howard Taft, played such a leading roll.

#### MEDICAL CARE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill which would remove medical care beneficiaries from the welfare rolls of the individual States, H.R. 4388.

Among the recent messages from the White House to the Congress has been the President's message with regard to medical care. This raises again the entire question of medical care which can be provided in this country for all of our citizens regardless of their age or their financial condition. There are not many Americans who would contest the principle that we should all have available the kind of medical care which our doctors and our scientists have made possible. There is still, however, a considerable dispute as to the means by which this care should be provided particularly to those segments of the population who by reason of age and financial inability have difficulty in getting the kind of hospital treatment and the kind of medical treatment that they need.

Much has been done in this field already, and it is interesting to examine where we now stand with regard to medical care programs. We should also look into some of the suggestions of things that can be done to improve our current legislation on this subject. A program for medical assistance for the aged has been in operation in Maryland since June 1, 1961. This was made possible by the so-called Kerr-Mills bill which was passed by the 86th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower in 1960.

Like the other assistance programs in the State, the medical assistance for the aged program is under the supervision of the State department of public welfare and is administered by the county department of public welfare in 23 counties and by the Baltimore City Department of Public Welfare. The department of public welfare is responsible for certification of eligibility for this aid and reinvestigation and recertification are made annually if warranted by changes in the recipient's circumstances. Identifying the need for and arranging medical care, however, are the responsibility of the State department of health in accordance with the contract between the department of welfare and the department of health.

Under this program, in fiscal year 1962, 10,881 applications for medical aid were approved within the State of Maryland. In the first 6 months of fiscal year 1963—that is, from July 1 of 1962 through



December 31 of that year—there were 4,417 applications approved. Thus, you will see there is a considerable acceptance of medical aid under this program which has the substantial approval of the medical profession and of the public officials of the State of Maryland. There are, however, improvements that could be made. One of the objections to the Kerr-Mills plan as it is now administered is that applicants must apply to the State welfare department. Many people feel that there is a certain stigma to making applications for welfare aid. This objection has some basis in fact because those who receive medical aid through the welfare department may not otherwise be needful of welfare assistance.

I have, therefore, introduced into the House of Representatives H.R. 4388, a bill which will change the Kerr-Mills law permitting individual States to select the agency to be responsible for medical assistance for the aged. This will be to every State's advantage and I believe that it will simplify efforts to provide comprehensive and continuous care to all of our citizens who need it. Through changes such as this, the Kerr-Mills medical program can be improved to meet the demands of the American people for the best medical care for all of our citizens.

#### THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a man who had climbed up the ramp, his lifeless limbs encased in irons, and leaning on the arm of his eldest son James, was inaugurated as President of the United States. Before him was a Bible that for 300 years had been in the Roosevelt family, a source of strength for many generations. That Bible was open to a page in the book of Corinthians with the counsel of the ages—faith, hope, and charity.

The counsel of the Bible, counsel that had given strength to peoples in many troublesome periods of the world, was the reliance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States.

I remember so well those years. Nobody had any money. Few had food sufficient for the nourishment of their families. The banks had failed. There were no jobs. The savings of people had been wiped out. There seemed no hope. Day after day, week after week, month after month, American people went through the wilderness of hopelessness, strengthened only by the admonition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to have faith and courage and to go ahead with faith and with courage—and then day would break—and the march in the wilderness would be ended.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any man in the history of the world gave as much to a

suffering people as Franklin Delano Roosevelt did through his example of courage, and faith that out of the darkness of every night there comes the dawn of a new day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the House appreciates the fact that the distinguished gentleman has taken this time to commemorate the occasion 30 years ago when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States. And with his inauguration a new era of hope and a new era of opportunity was inaugurated also for the American people.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one evening when I was in the city hall in Chicago and the word came of the passing of President Roosevelt. As I left the city hall, scrubwomen were in tears. As I came into the streets of Chicago, men and women and children were crying—so deeply had the image of Franklin Delano Roosevelt reached into the hearts and minds of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I will make this observation. In one of the Chicago papers yesterday, there was a photograph of President Roosevelt on the occasion of his inauguration. By his side in that photograph was James, his eldest son. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that James, his eldest son, is a Member of this body and that he is carrying on in the pattern and in the spirit of his father.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that in my very humble way, I am seeking to carry on in the pattern of the man I, with all my countrymen, looked to for spiritual as well as material strength when ours was a stricken Nation with no hope save in Franklin Delano Roosevelt, counseling us to faith and courage as we marched out of the wilderness.

I was born in the same year of 1882. He was 51 when he was inaugurated President. I was approaching my 51st birthday. I am still here—I do not know for how long, but as long as I am here I shall try to go on in my humble way in the years ahead inspired in the doing of the work of each passing day by one who inspired me then, and now to all is an inspiration of immortality.

Yes, in the darkness of the night—no hope. And I know, because people would come to me who had everything wiped out, who did not know how they could go on; and then Franklin Delano Roosevelt would speak to the Nation and overnight courage came, and faith, and a suffering people marched out of the wilderness. How they did it I do not know, if the measure of their power to survive and to conquer overwhelming odds of adversity was material. But they did it by the inspiration of a great soul, one of the great souls in the history of our world.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I touch on one other matter mentioned on the opened page of the 300-year-old family Bible lying before Franklin Delano Roosevelt

on his inaugural 30 years ago today—charity. Faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

Preceding the Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the Presidency of Mr. Hoover. In those days of the great depression when our people were entrapped in the wilderness of despair, Mr. Hoover was blamed for very much that had happened. It always seems that when one gets caught in a time of collapse he is blamed for everything, even though the collapse had come from a chain of preceding events not of his immediate making. Mr. Speaker, I think we all are happy that today in the evening of his life ex-President Hoover is respected and beloved by all his fellow citizens. And I know that no one would wish me more to say this than Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as in each succeeding generation we go through the many problems of our Nation, and as we argue, sometimes bitterly in the intensity of varying convictions, that as time goes on and makes evaluation of what we in each generation have done, that there will be a reflection in that evaluation of that charity that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had in mind when he had before him at his inauguration this page from the 300-year-old family Bible: Faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

And so let us give to all our fellow Americans full credit for sincerity. All seek to serve God, country, and mankind. And when time has passed let history be equally charitable and say that the Franklin Delano Roosevelts and the Herbert Hoovers and all were great Americans, that they had at heart the interests of their people and of mankind. The differences that divide in days of great crises are best forgotten and erased from memory. Ours cannot remain a great nation, the bulwark of freedom, if there are not always differences of opinion, honestly presented, honestly fought out, with a mutuality of respect that is part and parcel of our American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I was humbly grateful when you asked me to make these remarks. I have been speaking from the heart and not from a manuscript, not even from any mental notes to guide the continuity. I am speaking, as one who went through those frightful years of the depression leaning upon a great spirit, lifted with my countrymen to the heights of the physically impossible by the presence of a great soul, inaugurated 30 years ago today as President of the United States.

#### MARCH 4—AN ANNIVERSARY DAY

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for taking this time to commemorate the 30th anniversary

of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for his first term as President.

March 4, 1933, is surely one day in our Nation's history that will long be remembered. Thirty years ago today, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States. Most of us can still vividly remember the depths of despair into which the Nation had fallen in that fourth year of the great depression. It can be truly said that FDR's first important act was his inaugural address. The eloquent words he spoke that day, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," helped to restore the Nation's confidence in itself. The lack of that national self-confidence was undoubtedly the most dangerous aspect of those black days. President Roosevelt was able to transmit that personal courage, which had enabled him to conquer his own physical handicap, into the inspiration which restored the courage of a whole people.

Many of our senior colleagues began their service in this House on a March 4 in the past. Four of our fellow Members are today celebrating anniversaries of decades of service to their country:

CLARENCE CANNON, the esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who entered the House 40 years ago today after a distinguished career as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives; and EMANUEL CELLER, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, also began his service in this House 40 years ago. His fight against monopoly and for the protection of civil liberties and civil rights has gained him a well-earned place in the history of the fight for equal treatment for all.

On the same day 30 years ago when Franklin Roosevelt delivered that eloquent inaugural address, three of our distinguished senior colleagues entered upon their long careers of service in the national House of Representatives.

WILLIAM M. COLMER, the ranking Democratic member of the House Rules Committee who has a long record of dedicated service on that most important Committee; and THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, my beloved fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee to whom I have often turned for counsel and advice in order to benefit from his many years of experience.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, the revered chairman of the Democratic conference and one whose skill and fairness as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House has been recognized and appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Today we also celebrate the anniversaries of distinguished service, though not of even decades, of three others of our fellow members.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., our distinguished former Speaker and earnest advocate of his party's cause who has won the admiration and affection of Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, who entered this House 38 years ago today; and WRIGHT PATMAN, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee whose spirited devotion to the interests of the less-favored has been

an inspiration to us all, who entered this House 34 years ago.

HOWARD W. SMITH, the astute and able chairman of the Rules Committee, known to us all affectionately as Judge SMITH, who has always treated every Member with consideration and fairness in fulfilling his responsibilities for the managing of the House's business, who entered this House 32 years ago today.

These constitute the total membership of the House who were sworn into office on a 4th of March. In 1933, the 20th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified which changed the starting dates of Presidential and congressional terms to January 3.

Two other of the distinguished senior Members of this body have a record of service prior to 1933, but they were elected in the middle of congressional terms to fill vacant seats:

CARL VINSON, who has served longer in this body than any other living Member, is the House's preeminent expert on national defense matters. I look forward to November 3, 1964, when we can congratulate the dean of this House on 50 years of loyal and distinguished service to his country as a Member of this body.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, our esteemed Speaker, will celebrate 35 years of continuous service in this body on November 6 of this year. Before his election as Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN W. MCCORMACK had an unequalled record of service to his party and country in his position as Democratic leader under Speaker Rayburn and as the architect of many of the important measures passed in the last 35 years to strengthen the Nation's defenses and to protect the welfare of its citizens.

I know I speak for every Member of this House in congratulating these 10 men on their long records of service and in expressing the wish of us all that they be with us for many more years so that we may have the continued benefit of their mature judgment and great wisdom.

#### SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency co-operation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1963.

#### SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the 17th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1963.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### PROVIDING ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-INCURRED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 274) and ask for its immediate consideration.



The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby tenders its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, whose 35th anniversary as its Parliamentarian occurred on January 1, 1963, in recognition of his dedication to this House, his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members, and his exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous response of the Members of the House on this resolution makes it almost anticlimactic for anyone to make a speech. But I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a few words.

Mr. Speaker, this is a high privilege that I now have. It is with great pride that I offer this resolution in my name. But, Mr. Speaker, as much as I would cherish the honor, this resolution is not just offered on my own behalf alone. It is offered on behalf of the great and distinguished Speaker of the House; it is offered on behalf of the great and distinguished minority leader; it is offered on behalf of the entire leadership on both sides of the aisle. More important, it is offered indeed, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives and all its Members.

Yesterday was Lew Deschler's birthday. This year also marks his 36th year of service as Parliamentarian of the House. In honoring this great American on this occasion the House does honor to itself.

Lewis Deschler was born in Chillicothe, Ohio, on March 3, 1905, the son of Joseph Anthony and Lillian Louise—Lewis—Deschler, who are still residing in Chillicothe.

Mr. Deschler began his higher education at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, where he was a student from 1922 to 1925. During these years at Miami, he played tackle on the varsity football squad and engaged in other extracurricular activities. In 1925, he came to Washington, D.C., where he completed his undergraduate work at George Washington University. In 1932 he received both the degrees of juris doctor and master of patent law from National University in Washington, and in 1947 he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws from the same university. He took the examination for the District of Columbia bar in 1934 and received the highest score ever given on the exam to that date. He was admitted to the District of Columbia bar in the same year. On motion of Hatton Summers he became a member of the U.S. Supreme Court bar in December 1937.

On January 18, 1931, Mr. Deschler married Virginia A. Cole of Washington, D.C. They have two children: Lewis Deschler II, an attorney practicing in Boca Raton, Fla.; and Joan Mari—Mrs. William B. Eddy—who resides with her husband and two children in Bethesda, Md. Mr. Deschler has one brother, Kenneth Deschler, living in Secaucus, N.J.

Lewis Deschler's career on Capitol Hill began in December of 1925—69th Congress, 1st session—when he was appointed by Speaker Longworth to be messenger at the Speaker's table, U.S. House of Representatives. He performed the duties of the timekeeper. At that time there was no position at the Speaker's desk carrying the title of Parliamentarian. The functions of Parliamentarian were performed by the Clerk at the Speaker's table, a position which had been filled by Lehr Fess, of Ohio, since the 66th Congress, 2d session—1919. In 1927—69th Congress, 2d session—the title of the position was changed to Parliamentarian—44 Stat. 1150, Public Law 631, 69th Congress—and the position of Assistant Parliamentarian was created—House Resolution 365, January 31, 1927. Mr. Deschler became the first Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, effective February 1, 1927, and served in this capacity until January 1, 1928, when he succeeded Mr. Lehr Fess as Parliamentarian. He has served as Parliamentarian continuously since that date; thus, on January 1, 1963, he began his 36th year in that position and he is currently in his 38th year of service in the House. During this long career, Mr. Deschler has had the honor to serve under Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin, and McCormack.

On many occasions over the past several years I have heard the beloved Speaker McCormack say, without equivocation and without qualification, that "Lew Deschler is the greatest Parliamentarian in the world." I believe that is a fact. Lew Deschler knows the rules of this House, the parliamentary procedure of this House as nobody else on earth ever knew them. The parliamentary language of this House, in every conceivable procedural situation, is as much a part of his vocabulary as the words he learned at his mother's knee. To the presiding officer either of the House or of the Committee of the Whole, his work has been indispensable. He never forgets, he never falters, he never fails.

But perfect practitioner that he is, Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler is more than this. He is a philosopher and historian of parliamentary law. He knows and loves the rules of this House. He knows when and why they were developed. He knows their importance to the dignity and decorum of the House, which itself has been his life and his love. He knows the pitfalls that accompany departures from parliamentary procedure, pitfalls both to individual Members and to the prestige and to the role of the House itself.

Lew Deschler has combined this great knowledge of parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure and his long years of experience in this House with rare and innate qualities of judgment and insight. He has the ability to sense instinctively almost the important missions of each succeeding Congress. Though his job is entirely objective, he has a talent for sifting the legislative wheat from the chaff. He knows when

a transitory victory in a legislative battle may cost the legislative war. He knows the value of timing in the legislative process.

Lew Deschler has served at the right hand of many great Speakers, all of whom I have previously named. Every one of them, and they have all been preeminent judges of men, has singled Lew out for the quality of his service to the House. In the language of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler has earned the commendation of us all for his exceptional contribution to the operation of the rules of the House, for his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and to Members of the House, and for the quality, and the dedication, and the importance of his service to this body.

I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; I also thank him for myself and for all of the Members on my side of the aisle for his presentation of this resolution. Too often it has seemed to me that some of the good things that we can say about people who are with us are delayed too long.

I seldom deal in superlatives but agreeing with our able Speaker I want to say that Lew Deschler is the world's greatest Parliamentarian, and that I realize is taking in a lot of territory.

I never cease to be amazed at the length and breadth of his knowledge of the rules of the House of Representatives.

These rules, as we all know, have evolved out of decades of experience and are designed to protect the rights not only of the minority, but of the 435 individual Members of this body.

Obviously, without them, we never would get anything done around here.

Sometimes I think it is a miracle that we accomplish what we do even with the rules to keep us in line with proper procedure.

Certainly one of the reasons is because we have a Parliamentarian who, throughout his career, has shown a capacity for a completely fair application of those rules.

Through the years that I have known Lew Deschler ours has become one of the closest personal relationships, and never has it made the slightest bit of difference in that relationship, especially as it had to do with the business of this House, whether I was a member of the majority party or the minority party.

I say without equivocation that never have I known Lew Deschler's advice, his judgment or his decisions to be influenced by any partisan considerations whatsoever.

My admiration for him as a man goes far beyond my respect for Lew Deschler as an officer of the House. He has a deep understanding of his job that transcends its purely technical aspects.

In my years of service here I have known no other person more fiercely proud of the highest traditions of the House of Representatives, and no other

who has been more careful or more determined to protect and maintain the prestige and standing of this body.

People reach the top in their chosen field only because of strong motivation. It is this complete dedication to our great institution that has made Lew Deschler the very best, and I wish him many, many more years of distinguished service to the Congress and his country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the offering of this resolution and the remarks of various Members are a complete surprise to our distinguished friend. I might make the observation in connection with the surprise that when I recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma and he addressed me to offer a resolution, Lew Deschler turned to me and said, "Did you know about this?"

I said, "Yes; and you had better stay here because I am afraid there might be a point of order made. So you had better stay here." So it was a complete surprise to our dear and distinguished friend.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has covered the background of the years of dedicated service of Lew Deschler to this great body. My remarks will be made from another angle, about Lew Deschler the man. It is true that whenever I introduce Lew Deschler to anyone, particularly those from abroad, I always introduce him as the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world, and that is true. But more than being a Parliamentarian he is a human being, he is a man possessed of nobility of character, with a fine, broad understanding outlook on life and a sweet and noble philosophy of life.

In addition, he is a man of wisdom, a man whose influence in the legislative affairs of our country for so many years has been tremendous, unseen possibly from the angle of the public but well known to each and every Member who has ever served in this great body.

As my dear friend from Indiana, the minority leader, so well said, Lew Deschler "is dedicated to the House of Representatives." He is loyal to the House as such. He is loyal to whoever might be the presiding officer of the House without regard to what the presiding officer's political party or affiliation might be. His views, his opinions, are sought not only by the Speakers that he has served with, and I might use the words under or in cooperation with, but also by all Members of the House, and his views and his opinions are profoundly respected.

My friends from Oklahoma and from Indiana, as I have said, have covered not only Lew Deschler personally but Lew Deschler's contribution as Parliamentarian. I like to look at him and to make my remarks from the angle of Lew Deschler the individual. He was here when I first came to Congress a little over 35 years ago. During my period of service there has developed between Lew Deschler and JOHN McCORMACK a feeling of friendship which I shall always treasure.

One of the most ennobling influences of my life has been the fact that by reason of my service in this body I have been able to meet so many fine Members, men and women, possessed of beautiful minds, who, without regard to party, have been dedicated to the service of our country. Among all of them there is none who will forever as long as I live occupy a more treasured position in my mind than our dear friend Lew Deschler.

To Lew and to Mrs. Deschler, and to his parents and his other loved ones, I extend my hearty congratulations not only on his birthday anniversary of yesterday but on this anniversary today in his official position as Parliamentarian. May God continue to bless Lew for countless years to come in the service of our country and particularly in the service of this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

I now yield to the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler has set a high standard for ability, for tireless dedication, and for wise and honest counsel. As the minority leader has said, and as the distinguished Speaker of the House has said, he is unquestionably the greatest Parliamentarian in all of the world. Historians will never be able to trace the very far reaching influence of this man in helping the House of Representatives to pass well-conceived and well-thought-out legislation, and legislation able to pass the constitutional test. Every Member, as the Speaker of the House has just said, who has sat in this House at any time in the past 36 years will bear testimony that his influence has had a tremendous impact and that he has contributed far more than the world will ever know toward maintaining the dignity and the supremacy of this great body.

I think one of the great characteristics of this man, speaking of him as a man, as the distinguished Speaker just did, is that no one ever questions his impartiality. Everyone knows that when one of us has the privilege of presiding as chairman in the Committee of the Whole, or sometimes when the Speaker of the House designates one of us as Speaker pro tempore, we are constantly, so to speak, in the hands of the Parliamentarian. When someone makes a point of order or raises a parliamentary question or whatever the situation may be, we turn immediately to the Parliamentarian and he advises us. It has been my observation over the years regardless of whether we have had a Democrat or a Republican sitting in the Speaker's chair, and regardless who may have been presiding in Committee of the Whole, no one ever questions the fairness or objectivity of Lew Deschler. To my way of thinking, that has been one of his very important contributions to this great body. Our distinguished Speaker has described Lew Deschler as the greatest Parliamentarian. I remember when another great Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, used to say he was, to quote, "A big brain man." I think that describes Lew very adequately. He is a

big man in every sense of the word. He understands the bigness of this country and the challenges that this country faces. He understands the unique and magnificent role that the House of Representatives plays in carrying on the spirit and the strength of our democratic institutions in the United States of America.

So it is my great pleasure, number one—to express my profound gratitude to Lew Deschler for the great help he has given to me over the years both as a Member of this body and as one who has had some minor responsibility in the leadership—and that has been a personal matter and one for which I will be forever grateful; and number two—to say to him, I join with all your colleagues in wishing for you and your family a happy birthday chronologically and a happy birthday as an officer of this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished Speaker and the leaders on both sides in extending congratulations to our beloved and distinguished friend and Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, and at the same time also to extend my felicitations to him on the occasion of his birthday yesterday.

I wish also to join others in expressing my appreciation for our distinguished majority leader's presenting the resolution today appropriately recognizing the life work of our Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

Apocryphal to what our distinguished majority whip has just said, I recall one occasion which I think would be appropriate to include in these remarks. Legislation was being considered in the House; one of the Members serving as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole; some question was raised by a Member regarding a parliamentary matter; the Chairman of the Committee remarked that the Parliamentarian said it was so-and-so. It was a little out of the ordinary for a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to say that for the Record, but it is so obvious, it was so true.

And I want to associate myself with the appropriate and splendid remarks that have been made here about my good friend who has always so willingly and gladly given counsel and advice.

Lew, we wish you the best for many, many more years of fine service, because you have meant so much to us as a group, to us as individuals, to me not only as a Member, but also as chairman of one of the great committees of this House; and I personally want to thank you for it.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join others in paying this deserved tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of this House. I recall more than fourteen years ago when I first came here, the distinguished gentleman whom I suc-



ceeded in the House and who now serves this Nation as Vice President, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, gave me much valuable and good advice. One of the most valuable pieces of advice he ever gave me was:

You get to know the Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler. He is a wise man, he is a good man, he is nonpartisan, and he will always advise you not only as to the rules of the House, not only as to the proper procedure, but also as to the proper conduct of a Member of the House.

The two of them have been fast and good personal friends over the years.

I took advantage of that advice and as a result of the Vice President's wise judgment I have been afforded a personal and close friendship which means much to me and will always mean much to me. I expect Lew Deschler enjoyed, as much as any mortal man, the friendship and confidence of the immortal and beloved Sam Rayburn. I do not believe there was ever a day went by that Mr. Rayburn did not in some way or in other refer to Lew Deschler as his friend and confidant. Not only did Mr. Rayburn think of him as a big brain, but more important than that, as a big man with a big heart.

I think it is a great privilege for all of us who come to this House not only to know Lew Deschler as a valiant champion of the House and of the Members of the House, see him take pride in the House and do his best to see that the House maintains its prestige and place in this capital, but also to be afforded his friendship and advice. We can rejoice in the pardonable pride that his father and mother, his wife, Virginia, her parents, and their children have in him, not only because of today but particularly because of what he has meant to them, to his friends, and to this country. All the members of the family are in Washington today, or most of them are, to help celebrate this day with him.

And so, to Lew Deschler, go my congratulations, my thanks, and my best wishes.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in my 37 or 38 years here I have had the good fortune and great privilege of meeting some of the finest men I have ever met in all my life or ever expect to meet. When I first came up to Washington it was with a Member of Congress with whom I was closely associated prior to that time, in fact, a relative. He said to me:

Herbert, in getting around try to meet some smart people, try to meet people who have been around, people who amount to something.

I followed his advice, and as I met these people who were the leaders on the majority side at that time and on the minority side, I always heard them mention this fellow Deschler's name.

So I made it my business to get acquainted with Mr. Deschler.

Mr. Speaker, I can sincerely say that fortunate is the man who knows Lew Deschler.

Lew Deschler has helped more individual Members of this House and their staffs than any man I know of on this side of the Capitol, because if you are fortunate enough to get advice from Mr. Deschler, it is good advice. I have often heard the former Speaker of this House, Mr. Rayburn, say, "When I am talking I am not learning anything." So I had the privilege many times of being in Mr. Deschler's company and of listening to him talk to other people. I learned something about the operations of this House and the things that had gone on in the past as well as his prediction of the things that would take place in the future.

It has been one of the great privileges in my life to know this fine Christian gentleman, and I am everlastingly grateful for having had the opportunity of this great association, this fine association, because he has meant so much to me. I am proud to call you, Lew, my friend.

I hope you spend many, many more happy birthdays and continue to render to the Members of this House impartially, in the future as you have in the past, the wonderful service you have given the House of Representatives, the Congress, and this Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It is now with pleasure that I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure to me to get up and wish Lew Deschler a happy birthday at this time.

I suppose I go back as far as anyone, so far as Lew Deschler is concerned. When I first came down here with my husband there were a lot of greenhorns around, just as there are today who did not know anything about parliamentary law. So they asked Lew Deschler if he would give them lessons. They would come to our house, Clarence Hancock, Bill Hess, Carroll Beedy, and others, of an evening. Lew certainly put them over the bumps. It was wonderful.

I must say at that time I was not very greatly interested in politics. Of course, I was interested in my husband's service in the House, but I did not expect to be down here myself. Even so I found it fascinating.

Mr. Deschler was a most wonderful teacher in addition to being a most delightful person to have around.

I do wish you, Lew, every joy in the world, and a lot more years. May I congratulate the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have had his services for so many, many years. Heaven bless you, my dear.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, following my colleague from Ohio, may I say that I have probably known Lew Deschler longer than any other Member of this House, because I have known him since he was a lad of 13, back in

1918. I knew his father and his grandfather before him.

So, it has been a real pleasure to me to sit here today and listen to the tributes which have been paid to a wonderful man, Lew Deschler, by those who have served with him here in the House of Representatives.

As has already been said, Lew is a big man in many, many ways. He is a big man physically. Lew and I have had a little joke between us for a good many years—because Chillicothe is just up the tracks a piece from my hometown—about erecting a statue to Lew in Chillicothe. We have always said it should be of gold but have always insisted Lew should first go on a diet to hold down the cost of his statue.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you think Lew Deschler is a big man physically, you should have seen his grandfather, who would make Lew look like a little boy if he were standing beside him today. He too was a great American, as was Lew's father.

Mr. Speaker, Lew comes from the old stock. Chillicothe was the first capital of Ohio, as you all know, and from those hills that make up the background of the seal of the State of Ohio came the pioneers, who in turn have given Lew not only a strong constitution and great physical strength, but a strong character, a great moral strength, and unusual mental capacity, which has permitted him to become the renowned Parliamentarian that he has been described here today, but also a truly great man, which counts the most, after all.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to join in this well-deserved tribute to our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler.

Everything has been said so well that I will merely tell one story and then make one point. It happens that a number of years ago, some years after the late Speaker Rayburn had broken Henry Clay's record of service—that of longest service as Speaker of the House of Representatives—I happened to go into Speaker Rayburn's office when he and Lew were discussing some problem. Shortly thereafter Mr. Deschler left. The Speaker and I began to discuss a variety of matters. I said "Mr. Speaker, you probably know more about the rules of the House than anybody in the history of the House." The Speaker looked at me and said, "There is only one man around here who knows the rules of the House. He just left. Lew Deschler."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Speaker Rayburn meant exactly what he said and I expect he was telling the precise truth.

Mr. Speaker, there is one characteristic of Lew that has not been brought out today. He was surprised by this event. In fact, I think he learned only a few seconds ago that some members of his family were more aware of the coming event than he. One of the

things you must recognize about him is that he probably views these proceedings with mixed emotions. He has had an enormous influence on the Members and the proceedings of this House for many decades and yet he is less well-known in the United States than many men of less importance here. That is entirely deliberate on his part. He has a real passion for anonymity. He wants to do things, and not talk about them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure again to congratulate our fine Parliamentarian.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for those very pertinent and accurate observations.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have addressed the House on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this resolution, and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lewis Deschler has functioned in the office of the Parliamentarian of the House for a period of 36 years. It is a fitting tribute that on this day the House by resolution pays tribute to his honorable and distinguished services in this capacity.

The office of Parliamentarian covers many important segments of the business of the House: the assignment of messages and resolutions to the committee properly having jurisdiction of the subject matter; the rulings on sundry motions, points of inquiry, and order made by the membership in the hearings on the floor at various stages during the progress of legislation.

Lewis Deschler has through the years established himself as a final authority in the specialized field. The importance of his rulings has guided the destiny of hundreds of pieces of legislation through the House of Representatives.

The many miscellaneous questions of parliamentary nature arising in committee or in conference between both Houses and settled through his good offices are matters of legislative history.

His high talents in this service have earned for him the respect of the membership and the appreciation of the leadership of the House of Representatives.

His constant application to the duties of his office together with a continuing study in research on questions pertinent to his specialization has given to him a national recognition as an expert authority in his field.

His intellectual and legalistic mastery of Jefferson's Manual and the ten thousand rulings on parliamentary questions decided in the highest parliamentary controlled body from its very beginning have marked him as a master in his chosen field of endeavor.

His valuable service to the Congress has been the controlling factor in keeping legislation within the constitutional limits prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

His assistants, William P. Cochrane and William H. Brown, reflect the thorough training received under his tutelage. The old adage of the teacher and the efficiency of the pupil is no better demonstrated.

We, of the Illinois delegation, are proud of the important services rendered by our friend and distinguished public servant Lewis Deschler, and give public thanks to him for his many years of dedication to the American people.

May God bless him and his family with health and happiness, and to him many years of continued service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the past two elections happily have brought a goodly number of new Members to the minority side of this body.

As a freshman in the 87th Congress, I can attest from personal experience the fair and helpful way in which Lew Deschler fulfills the office of Parliamentarian. As teacher, technician, and friend, he has been most helpful.

I know from contacts with other new Members that this same fine standard has been applied to all.

Our very best wishes to Mr. Deschler on this anniversary.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, I have had occasion to call on our Parliamentarian, Mr. Lew Deschler, for assistance and advice. I have found him to be most cordial and helpful, and I am most appreciative of his service and knowledge. It is a pleasure to join in the ceremony congratulating Lew Deschler on the occasion of his birthday.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to what has been so eloquently and so justifiably said about the distinguished service of our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. I join in what has been said about this truly able and truly fine official of the House. But I, and only I can testify to the personal respect and great affection I have for him. Even as I attempt to do so I cannot find the words adequately to express what is in my mind and heart.

That Lew has sat at the Speaker's table since 1925 and has been our Parliamentarian since 1928, under eight Speakers, both Republican and Democrat, itself attests to the quality of his service and the quality of the man himself. As Parliamentarian he may be said to be the chief legal adviser of our Speaker and whomever may occupy the chair as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. Not infrequently the Chair is obliged to make an immediate ruling on an extremely difficult question, but Lew is there to advise the Chair instantly as to exactly what the precedents are on such an issue. That there should be an absence of appeals from the Chair's rulings bespeaks the soundness and the fairness of the advice the Chair receives from Lew.

There is considerably more involved in connection with the position of Parliamentarian than advising the Chair dur-

ing the course of proceedings on the floor. That the legislative program is handled so expeditiously on the floor from day to day is due to the thorough preparations made for the business of the day by the Parliamentarian. Frankly, I am sometimes amazed how he seems to anticipate the unexpected, and I think this is because he is familiar with every aspect of every bill that is called up.

Lew is now serving his 36th year as our Parliamentarian. I congratulate him. On this occasion we Members of the House might appropriately congratulate ourselves in having such a man as Lew Deschler in the service of the House. Without him the House will not be the same, and we sincerely hope he will be our Parliamentarian for many, many more years.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to be included with those who are praising Lew Deschler on his birthday today. Anyone who has observed Capitol Hill over the last 30 years can testify to his great contribution to the legislative process. Both in character and ability he has made a record which has impressed everyone who has had occasion to come in contact with him. His fairness in the discharge of his duties as Parliamentarian is universally acknowledged. Not many persons have the talent of being able to make vital decisions on the spur of the moment without question or criticism. But Lew has this talent and that is one of the reasons why he will be recorded as the greatest Parliamentarian in the history of the House of Representatives.

As a friend and admirer I extend my greetings and best wishes on this occasion.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian. I soon learned after my arrival in the House that Lewis Deschler is all that our great Speaker and majority and minority leaders have said. He is not only a walking encyclopedia of the rules and procedures of the House, but a patient and lucid teacher, ever willing to share his knowledge with the Members. The House indeed has been fortunate to have had the benefit of his invaluable service during the past 35 years. I want to add my voice in wishing continued success and happiness to Lewis Deschler and his family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, though mine has been a relatively short stay in Washington, it has witnessed and continues to realize the importance and expertness of Lewis Deschler, our House Parliamentarian. In a very real sense, his service in such capacity, of which this august body has been the fortunate recipient since 1928, has helped to sustain and vindicate the axiom that ours is a government of laws, not men. Serving as the parliamentary alter ego of the Speaker, and for that matter, of the entire membership, Lewis Deschler has cleared the well-known tight congressional procedural path time and time again in a way characterized as impartial, decisive, and quiet. His response to inquiries as to procedural stratagems and as to rights and privileges of Members has been particularly invaluable to my



congressional brethren as well as myself. Indeed, this great body has been and continues to be the better for its selection some 35 years ago of the outstanding ability and parliamentary wisdom of Lewis Deschler.

I congratulate Lew on his recent birthday anniversary, and, moreover, on the occasion of his 36th year of service as House Parliamentarian. His has been a long and productive service; may the House of Representatives continue to enjoy his wise and nonpartisan counsel for many years to come. May Heaven bless Lew Deschler, and may he continue to privilege this great Chamber with his presence.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am more than delighted that our majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, offered the resolution affording the House of Representatives the opportunity to extend its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, our Parliamentarian, who is now serving in his 36th year in this important capacity. Others have spoken of Lew Deschler as "the greatest parliamentarian in the world," of Lew Deschler "the man," of his great contributions to all of us as individual Members; and I would like to join with my colleagues in all of these expressions of recognition, appreciation, and high confidence in Lew Deschler, our friend.

More than this, I would also like to record for history the tremendous assistance Lew Deschler through the years has rendered to the professional staffs of the committees of the House of Representatives. As assistant counsel to the Education and Labor Committee in the 82d Congress, I learned that Lew Deschler was always available and often was called upon for opinions on parliamentary questions arising within the committees of the House, as well as to give advice regarding the rules and procedures for presenting committee legislation for floor action.

While I am confident that every Member of the House of Representatives who has ever served with Lew Deschler recognizes his outstanding contributions to the leadership of the House and the Members individually, I know that each staff member who has ever called on the Parliamentarian likewise could testify that his advice and assistance have been invaluable in the work of the Congress in the committees.

It is a great pleasure and privilege to join in saluting Lew Deschler for all of his many contributions. I extend to him my best wishes for many, many years of continued service in this most important position of service to our Nation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution tendering the thanks and appreciation of the House of Representatives to Lewis Deschler for his faithful service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for the past 35 years is a very fitting tribute to a great American.

Lewis Deschler is not only the greatest Parliamentarian of our times, but he has endeared himself to all Members of the House. In addition to his many splendid qualifications as Parliamentarian, he has those personal attributes

which make people admire and respect him.

It has been a real privilege for me to have been associated with Lewis Deschler throughout my service in the Congress, and I wish him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am privileged today to extend my sincere congratulations to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

This is a very great achievement and one I am sure that Lew is proud to claim. His devotion to his duties, to our Speaker and to the membership of this House is reflected in his modesty, but we all know he is, without a doubt, the greatest authority on parliamentary law in the United States today.

Above and beyond this acknowledged ability, Lew is a very human and understanding man. He is a humanitarian and is never too busy to lend a helping hand when requested to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are most fortunate to have had Mr. Deschler with us over the past 35 years and I hope the good Lord will watch over him and guide him for many more years to come.

Lew, we will always need your wisdom and your valuable assistance. Again please accept my heartiest congratulations on this very important occasion in your fabulous life on Capitol Hill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasantest associations I have enjoyed during my long service in the House has been with our able and distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, who has now entered upon his 36th year of service in this vitally important office. Not only has this been a delightful association, he is one of my closest and dearest friends in this body.

During my terms as Speaker in the 80th and 83d Congresses, he sat at my right hand. As any Speaker, of either party would testify, if any employee of the House is an indispensable man, it is Lew Deschler. His knowledge of the rules, precedents, and procedures of the House is profound and instantaneous. During my terms as Speaker, his services were of inestimable value. It would be impossible to exaggerate the value of his services to the Speaker and to the House.

There is no more dedicated and faithful public servant in our Government than Lew Deschler. He loves this House. He is a stalwart defender of its privileges, its rules and its dignity. He has earned the everlasting admiration, esteem, and respect of the entire membership of this body for his great ability, his knowledge, and his devotion to duty.

I hope he will continue in robust health so that he may serve the House for many years to come.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and the majority and minority leaders in extending my congratulations and best wishes to our well beloved and dedicated Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. At the same time I want to wish him a very happy birthday.

I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the counsel and advice which I have re-

ceived from him over the years. I can recall numberless occasions when his assistance proved invaluable.

It is a great privilege for all of us who come to the House of Representatives to meet and know Lew Deschler. He has proven to be a great champion of this legislative body and a symbol of reverence for its traditions.

Moreover, I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here about Lew. These tributes are sincerely meant and keenly deserved.

We wish you, Lew, many more years of fine service in behalf of the House of Representatives, and our Nation.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a brief word of congratulations to Lew Deschler in marking the 35th anniversary of his service as House Parliamentarian.

Without question, the ability of the House to act responsibly and progressively on legislation and in fulfilling its obligations to the many diverse and geographically disparate constituencies from which its members come depend upon the rules which it adopts and follows as a legislative body. The preservation of order, decency and regularity is of the greatest importance to our democracy.

No better statement of the purpose of the rules can be found than that set forth in Jefferson's Manual, which is in the hands of all House members in an edition which is prepared and revised regularly under the careful supervision of Lew Deschler. As Lew has noted, the rules under which the House operates today are perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body in the world.

We often hear criticism and complaint about rules when they seem to be invoked to prevent haste. Yet rules are established and maintained primarily to protect the rights of minorities, while permitting the majority to work its will.

In the course of daily events, the House and its Speaker and its members must rely constantly on the word and judgment of a man who is fully familiar with this body of rules, and it is in his knowledge and experience that the solution is found for steady and regular progress, without constant wrangling and captious argument.

This is an important and sensitive role, and it is one that Lew Deschler has discharged faithfully and well over many years, earning the praise and warm regard of the House.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I venture to add a new Member's word of appreciation to the eloquent and fully merited tributes which have been paid here today to the distinguished Parliamentarian of the House, Mr. Lewis Deschler.

Many a new Member has learned early in his service here that at least a modest working knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House is essential to his comprehension of the lawmaking process and his appropriate role in it. He is heartened to find that he is not without willing assistance in this effort at self-education.

Mr. Deschler is affable, patient and, above all, rich in knowledge of form and

precedent. One realizes quickly that 35 years of service have not dulled his enthusiasm for his work, or his pride in the responsibilities assigned him.

Every Member of the House, I am sure, is secure in the recognition that Mr. Deschler's counsel is available to all, and is given conscientiously, impartially and wisely.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly gratifying to praise the accomplishments of a selfless man. It doubles that satisfaction when the man who deserves and gets that praise is my friend. I add my voice to that of many others when I give just recognition to the more than 35 years of understanding service rendered to the House of Representatives by Lew Deschler.

Before I speak for anyone else, I first speak for myself. When I was new here, Lew personally helped me to avoid legislative mistakes. He increases my efficiency as the Representative of the people who send me here.

What Lew Deschler does for me, he does for every Member of the House who seeks his counsel.

This same patience and sagacity lubricate the parliamentary wheels of the full legislative body. As the years accumulate, as the influence of legislation enacted here increases around the world, as emerging nations struggle to form parliamentary systems of their own and emulate one already functioning, who but the probing historians of future years can fathom the impact this one quiet, knowledgeable man may have had on the history of his fellow men?

To paraphrase a verse from a New Testament parable, "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. His vast knowledge, unbelievable memory and alert mind have won him top recognition in his chosen field and every Member of the House will attest to the fair and impartial manner in which this outstanding capability is exercised. His ready smile is sincere and warm. His huge frame commands attention upon first meeting, but association soon demonstrates he possesses a heart and spirit of equal size.

Lew Deschler has seen history made during some of the most stirring periods of our Nation. His role, though great, has been little known, largely due to his quiet and unassuming manner, but those who have glimpsed him in action know how effective are his rapid fire responses as he counsels and advises. The tribute of the Speaker gives special validity to this attribute. It is my hope that Lew Deschler will continue to discharge his important service to our Nation for years to come. We congratulate him on his birthday and extend every good wish.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in all the words they have uttered in praise of our able Parliamentarian Lew Deschler. Lew was on the job when I came to Congress almost a quarter of a century ago, and I learned quickly to seek his counsel and advice, all of which proved to be good. Lew Deschler possesses that sixth sense, to see

the right, and to live right during every minute of the day.

I could go on for hours, Mr. Speaker, expounding my high esteem of this great and good man, but it is simply not possible to gild the rose, neither is it possible to say anything that would add to the love and high esteem that all have who know well, my friend, Lew Deschler.

I only wish for you, Lew, many more years of service to the Members of Congress and to our beloved Nation, which you have served so well for over one-third of a century.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a legislative body like the House of Representatives with 435 Representatives of such widely different areas and interests, the daily functioning of the House in a smooth and orderly way is a continuing tribute to its Parliamentarian.

However, on the occasion of Lew Deschler's 35th anniversary in that post, it is fitting to pay special and explicit tribute to the service he has rendered to the House and, with exemplary impartiality, to all its Members. The rules of the House are both numerous and technical. There are more than 11,000 rulings that constitute precedents for the conduct of House business. In these circumstances, the sureness with which Lew Deschler makes his judgments, represents ample evidence of his immense accumulation of knowledge and of his dedication to his work.

I should like to join many of my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished Parliamentarian on his anniversary and his birthday. I hope his highly valued service will continue so that I shall have many occasions in the future on which to renew these congratulations.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of well-deserved tribute paid to one of the best friends the House of Representatives has, Lewis Deschler. For more than 35 years he has displayed his genius as a parliamentarian. His guidance is accompanied always by wit and courtesy, and his warm good nature has endeared him to us all. Without subtracting from Lew Deschler's own outstanding talents, and with perhaps more truth than modesty, I would like to point out that he exemplifies the sort of character we from Ohio think of as typically Buckeye. In addition to having had the original good sense of being born in our great State, Lew comes from Chillicothe. As a freshman that won my heart immediately, since the Minshalls were politically active in Chillicothe for almost a century. All in all, it is hard to fault Lew Deschler, a man of enormous talent, graciousness, and dedication. Ohio is proud of him and the U.S. House of Representatives is deeply in his debt.

Mr. ALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, to conclude these remarks I would like leave of the House to read a letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, March 2, 1963.

HON. LEWIS DESCHLER,  
Parliamentarian, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEW: I have learned from the Speaker that on Monday you will be honored by the Members of the House of Representatives for your long record of service to the Con-

gress. In your parliamentary capacity over 36 years, you have played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity myself as a Member of Congress to know of your wise and effective influence.

With warmest best wishes.

Cordially,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the Truth-in-Lending Act. This bill, which is sponsored in the other body by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and other Senators, requires simply that there shall be a full written disclosure of charges for credit when credit is extended to consumers.

Installment buying is a major part of our economy. Since the end of World War II consumer credit has increased more than eightfold from less than \$6 billion in 1945 to more than \$55 billion. Although credit buying is a large segment of consumer buying, it is often impossible for the consumer to know exactly the price he pays for an item bought on credit.

Dr. Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., in testimony during the 1961 Senate hearings on automobile financing stated:

The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

In an article written by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO it is pointed out:

Easy credit and the ruthless imposition of consumer debt upon the unwary have led to frightful abuse and sometimes to tragic consequence. Because of the ignorance regarding the true costs of money, lives



have been needlessly scarred or even wrecked. Unless excesses are halted, the entire American business community may be discredited.

The truth-in-lending proposal spells out the disclosures, including the total amount to be financed, the amounts to be credited as downpayment and/or trade-in, which are to be made by merchants and lenders when they extend consumer credit. The information will enable the consumer to know how much is added by credit to the cost of things he buys. This legislation will aid almost every American. Economists estimate that almost every family uses some form of consumer credit at some time, and on the whole Americans spend 13 cents out of every dollar they earn for repayment of installment loans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will be acted upon favorably during this session.

### TAX PROGRAM

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of the House informed on the facts in connection with the President's tax proposals upon which the Ways and Means Committee is presently holding hearings, I would like to include as a part of my remarks the testimony of one of the best informed witnesses to appear on the tax question. He is Mr. Roswell Magill, of New York City, and the statement he presented to the committee this morning will appear at the end of these remarks.

I would like to emphasize that President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; and, fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control.

The testimony contained a six-point constructive tax recommendation with which I am in agreement:

First. Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

Second. To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

Third. The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 to 52 percent to expire on June 30, as scheduled.

Fourth. Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

Fifth. For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

Sixth. Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

Finally, a basic fallacy in the President's proposal, the longstanding policy on percentage depletion, is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In this constructive criticism of the President's tax proposals and the positive program offered, we have the basis for the discussion of a workable tax cut and reform program if the administration sincerely wants tax cuts and reform instead of just a political issue.

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY ROSWELL MAGILL, MARCH 4, 1963

The President's special message to Congress on January 24, 1963, is specifically addressed to two topics—tax reduction and tax reform. The recommendations in the message all have to do with the income tax. In general, the tax reform proposals are devised to recoup some of the revenue that would be lost if the tax reduction proposals were adopted.

The message was preceded by a number of speeches by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, emphasizing that the current Federal tax structure impedes economic growth. The prescription to cure that malady was said to be a substantial reduction in taxes on business and on the upper income brackets to stimulate investment incentives and unleash venture capital. The income tax was described as a drag on the economy.

These statements, with one notable exception, repeated in substance what the business community has said for years. The business community has emphasized that the weakness of the Federal tax structure lies primarily in the fact that the U.S. Treasury is almost wholly dependent for tax revenue upon the income tax; that a reduction in the steeply progressive income-tax rates, coupled with the substitution of another form of tax to produce some of the revenue now pro-

duced by the income tax would be highly desirable.

The reforms proposed in the special message are all income tax reforms. In general, they are devised to produce additional revenue from taxpayers in the middle and upper brackets. The Secretary of the Treasury has urged in substance that the two parts of the program should be adopted together; that the price of tax reduction is the adoption of the reforms, that if the reforms, or some of them, are not adopted, then the tax reduction program must be modified, at the expense of taxpayers in the middle and the upper brackets.

1. Will the administration's tax proposals achieve these objectives? It is unfortunate, however, that the tax package proposed by the administration is not well designed in the judgment of many of us to accomplish the objectives of removing barriers to business growth. The tax reduction and tax reform proposals appear to be contradictory. They contain conflicts both in purposes and ideas which tend to neutralize each other and thus to cancel out the good effects we seek. May I refer specifically to four of these conflicts.

2. The first contradiction is in the economic thrust of the entire program. The tax reductions proposed by themselves would be a constructive reform in our present income tax. The new scale of rates suggested for individuals—14 to 65 percent—represents an across-the-board reduction ranging from about 28 percent at the lowest income bracket to something over 20 percent at the highest and averaging about 23 percent. Such a reduction in rates has long been advocated by all who believe a lower tax burden is imperative.

Moreover, this proposal would be an excellent first step toward a long-range permanent income tax scale. Ultimately the top rate of the individual income tax should be brought down to 50 percent on the principle that a taxpayer's interest in earning a dollar of additional income should at least equal the Government's.

The administration has coupled these rate reductions with a series of revenue-raising measures labeled "tax reforms" which completely transform the proposed tax cuts. The tax liabilities are reduced by 40 percent at the lowest bracket, by 29 percent in the \$3,000-to-\$5,000 income bracket, and by only 9 percent in the \$50,000-and-over bracket. Minimizing tax reductions in the middle and upper income brackets while concentrating the tax relief in the lowest brackets, is justified by the proponents on the theory that what the economy needs is more consumer spending. While the President and Dr. Heller recognize the need to expand investment opportunities, the tax relief proposed is overbalanced in favor of more consumption spending.

Similarly, the proposal to lower the corporation tax is a first step in what I believe should be a most important long-range goal, namely to lower the level of business taxation. Profit margins would be increased and more earnings freed for business expansion. Lowering the corporate tax rate would be a fundamental step toward stimulating larger capital investment and furthering job opportunities and economic growth. But of the total \$10 billion reduction in tax liabilities in these proposals, less than one-fourth applies to corporations.

Moreover, the proposed rate reduction is coupled with a proposal to speed up corporation tax payments and 5 years will elapse before corporation tax payments are lower by the full extent of the 5 percentage point tax cut. The 5-percent cut in the corporate rate would still leave the corporation tax substantially higher than in the pre-Korean war years.

Less than a year ago, Secretary Dillon, arguing for the investment credit before the

Senate Finance Committee, said: "Some critics of the investment credit have suggested that we should approach the problem of increasing investment through tax changes by giving first priority to measures designed to add to consumer demand. We cannot be content merely with the level of capital formation that will result from response to increased consumer demand. The American economy now is in much need of modernization of its capital equipment which, in the technological environment of the 1960's, requires an increase in the ratio of capital to output. One of the important means of achieving a higher rate of economic growth lies precisely in increasing this ratio, and a direct approach to investment incentives is needed to accomplish this." Apparently, although the diagnosis remains unchanged, the remedy prescribed has now been reversed and the emphasis placed on increased consumer spending.

This confusion in the economic purposes of the tax program can give investors and businessmen, both large and small, little confidence in the administration's stated intentions to remove the barriers to investment.

3. Structural reforms versus revenue needs: A second conflict of aims is evident in the approach to reform of the tax structure. We can all agree that the tax system needs to be reconstructed in the interests of equity, simplicity, and better balance. The Federal tax structure for many years has placed too great a reliance on the income tax. Further, the system is tremendously and I believe needlessly complex. In recent years, many accusations have been leveled against it on the grounds of equity. Granted that structural reforms are needed, do the administration's proposals represent a good way to go about it? In my judgment, they do not.

Certainly, the proposed change in the taxation of capital gains to include in income a smaller percentage of long-term gains is a step in the right direction since it will serve the main purpose of encouraging investment. The same endorsement can be given to the proposals to limit the surtax exemptions of affiliated corporate groups and at the same time repeal the tax on consolidated returns. Some of the proposed changes in definitions of capital gains are desirable to offset abuses which have arisen in attempts to bring ordinary income under capital gains treatment. Some are not so desirable. For example, I question whether the change in the treatment of timber sales is a move in the right direction. A crop of timber requires many years for development. It is subject to many natural hazards. Congress adopted section 631 in the code after careful study to serve public interests; in this case to tax timber sales in a way which would encourage wise forest management. The provisions seem to have served their purpose well. What assurance do we have that the adoption of the proposed substitute treatment would achieve an equally good result?

The major base broadening and equity provisions, so-called, are not reforms at all but, as the Secretary admitted in his testimony to this committee, merely revenue-raising measures, attempts to recover some of the revenue lost through tax reductions. They strike with particular inequity at the middle and upper income brackets and wash out a substantial part of the tax relief granted by rate reductions.

When the Congress sets out to change the tax structure in the interests of equity and simplicity, it will certainly want to examine each of the deductions in order to arrive at the best possible policy decisions. But the proposed reduction in deductions by an amount equaling 5 percent of the taxpayer's gross income does not attack these deductions as loopholes or inequities; it leaves them in the structure without reference to whether they are good or bad. The so-called 5-percent floor under deduc-

tions is proposed simply to produce \$2.3 billion of additional revenue by denying in part deductions many of which have been in the income tax law for 50 years and which have long been recognized as fair and reasonable.

Similarly, the proposed tax on gains accrued at time of gift or death is a straightforward revenue-raising measure, involving in this instance a further problem of constitutionality. The proposed repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion moves in exactly the opposite direction from the policy carefully and determined by the Congress to be correct, namely that there should be some relief, however minimal, for the double taxation of dividend income.

The longstanding policy on percentage depletion is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In sum, these structural reforms would steepen the progression of the individual income tax, add a new layer of complex restrictions and requirements on top of existing complexities, free some groups of taxpayers from any tax, and limit tax relief in the middle and higher income brackets. Such measures cannot be termed "reforms" of the tax structure. They work against what should be our objectives for improving the system.

4. The third conflict is between short-term and long-run goals. In presenting his program, the President stressed the need to make long-range tax changes which will get the economy off the plateau on which it has rested for the past 5 years. To this end, he is willing to gamble increased deficits in the next few years to achieve more rapid economic growth and a balanced budget later. But the timing of the program is such that it cannot fully achieve either the stimulating or the capital expansion effects which are claimed for it.

If stimulation of the economy through more consumer spending is desired (and we must remember that only 6 months ago Dr. Heller was preaching the need for an immediate massive tax reduction not tied to any reforms), then what stimulation can we expect from rate reductions for individuals which will total only \$2.7 billion in 1963? Will these sufficiently offset the \$2 billion increase in social security taxes this year? Will they offset the expected rise of \$1.5 billion in State and local taxes this year? Will they offset the rise in State income taxes which will be the natural consequence of changes in the Federal tax base and Federal taxable income next year?

In the case of corporations, the effect of the acceleration of payments is to increase corporate tax payments in fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965. Not until fiscal 1966 will corporate tax payments decrease and then by only \$1 billion, less than 5 percent of corporate tax payments; and not until 1969 will the benefits from the five-point reduction leave \$2½ billion with corporations for expansion purposes.

Revenue reasons may dictate that tax reduction of the kind proposed should be spaced out over several years. But there must be some substantial effects immediately if we wish to start the economy moving at a more rapid pace. The result of phasing out the tax changes in this combination program will produce only a very modest increase in consumer purchasing power this year and next. It will produce practically no stimulus to increased savings, to investment incentives and to capital expansion for several years to come.

5. Will this program help balance the budget? Finally a conflict arises in the great gamble that increased deficits for the next few years will generate much larger revenues some years later. Why do we pay taxes at all? The obvious answer is that we pay taxes in order to meet Government expenditures. Tax revenues have not been high enough in recent years to keep up with rapidly increasing spending. Can we hope that the present program will change that situation?

Government expenditures have been rising rapidly year after year. This year's budget is \$6.5 billion higher than last year's, and that in turn was \$6.3 billion higher than the year before. Now an increase of \$4.5 billion is proposed for 1964. The deficits for the 4 fiscal years 1961 to 1964 will total over \$30 billion. In each year the requests for new obligational authority have exceeded expenditures. In the 1964 budget, new obligational authority exceeds proposed expenditures by \$9 billion. These are built-in increases for future spending.

In addition, the President has sent the Congress a whole series of messages suggesting new programs, all with modest beginnings but requiring heavier outlays in the future. While the President has stated that attempts are being made to hold down non-military spending, what confidence can we have in a future budget balance unless expenditures are brought under better control than heretofore? If the budget continues to rise at the rate that it has in recent years, will even these tax cuts, assuming that they have all the stimulating effects with which the administration endows them, succeed in generating sufficient revenues to catch up with the budget? It seems unlikely.

The only assurance we can have that the increased deficits due to the adoption of this tax program would ever be wiped out, would be a strong effort to bring expenditures under control. A first step would be to hold expenditures at the current year's (1963) level, and preferably at some lower level. This should be coupled with determined and vigorous action to reverse the trend of rising Federal expenditures and establish a stronger relationship between taxing and spending.

Secretary Dillon has argued that without the structural reforms the deficit would be too large. In that case it would be better to discard the reforms and make more modest cuts in taxes. In this connection it is well to observe that even a small change in the opening rate—applicable to 85 percent of all taxable income—would make unnecessary the adoption of the proposed revenue-raising reforms. For example, a scale ranging from 15 percent or 16 percent to 65 percent would produce between \$2 and \$4 billion more revenue than the 14 percent to 65 percent scale proposed, and would probably be just as effective in increasing investment incentives.

To summarize: There is a great need for a substantial income tax reduction both for individuals and for corporations. In view of the current and prospective deficits, it is probably wise to spread reductions over several years and accompany them by substantial cuts in expenditures. The goals sought by the President are important and ones which we can all endorse. We regret that it is unlikely that the tax package proposed by the administration will achieve these goals because it is a mixture of contradictory and often conflicting recommendations. The economic goal seems to be a stimulus to consumption spending whereas the need is to encourage greater investment. The program is a mixture of reductions and reforms, but the latter are principally revenue-raising measures which erode the purpose of free investment capital and would not improve the structure of the income tax. The timing of the proposals is a conflict be-



tween short- and long-term aims, with insufficient emphasis on what should be the primary goal, greater productivity and more jobs. Finally, the deliberate choice of larger deficits for the next few years is too risky when not coupled with better restraint and control over spending. It does not instill confidence that budget balance will result within the foreseeable future.

6. What kind of a program is needed?

I am convinced that major and permanent tax cuts at this time would be desirable. Several elements in the President's program move taxes in directions which in my opinion are sound. Others are not geared to the main goal of stepping up the flow of venture capital to productive enterprise.

The President has urged his critics to submit recommendations of their own. My recommendation to this committee is that it modify the President's program along the following lines:

(a) Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

(b) To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

(c) The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 percent to 52 percent to expire on June 30 as scheduled.

(d) Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

(e) For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

(f) Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

These tax changes would have the virtue of concentrating on the primary goal, to step up business and jobs. They should be accompanied by expenditure reductions and controls to minimize the risks of inflation and a further weakening of the dollar which a continued series of unbalanced budgets might otherwise entail. Such a program of expenditure control and tax reduction would have a strong stimulative effect on investment incentives and on corporate expansion programs. Tax burdens on individuals would be lowered substantially to encourage more consumer spending. The program would considerably lighten the tax burden on the vast majority of taxpayers in the lower income brackets. Further it would insure the accumulation of savings to permit greater investment, business growth, and more jobs.

We are in reasonable agreement with the administration on the aims and purposes of tax rate reduction. Our disagreement centers on the question whether the so-called reforms proposed by the President and the Secretary will not defeat the main purposes

on which we are agreed. In such a case, the part of wisdom would seem to be to push forward on the tax rate reduction program, to give the economy needed stimulation; and to subject the so-called reforms to further study.

The Nation simply cannot afford the archaic tax system that now saddles its people and its productive facilities. This committee's task is a formidable one, but I hope it will be able to seize this great opportunity for fundamental change and make a lasting contribution to America's future strength.

#### IDAHO TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Idahoans today celebrate their State's territorial centennial. The establishment of the Idaho Territory on March 4, 1863, came during tumultuous times, for our Nation was still in the midst of civil conflict.

The name "Idaho" is a derivation of the Indian word, "Ee-da-how," which means "Light on the Mountain." The country was first seen by white men when Lewis and Clark crossed the Continental Divide from what is now Montana and came down the Clearwater River through north-central Idaho. This identical historic route can now be traveled on the new Lewis and Clark Highway which crosses the midsection of the State through the Bitterroot Mountain Range to Lewiston.

Fur trappers and traders followed in the early 1800's. Many of the names of lakes, streams, and towns reflect the influence of early French-Canadian trappers and missionaries.

Gold, first discovered at Pierce, Idaho, in the fall of 1860, brought the next influx of white men. The discovery of this important metal greatly influenced the creation of the Idaho Territory when it became apparent that the stampede for gold would sufficiently change the distribution of population and threaten the control of the Washington Territorial legislature.

Idaho's central primitive area, penetrated by the Salmon River and its tributaries, remains today as formidable as it was when Lewis and Clark skirted its vertical canyons on their way west. The explorers heeded the Indians' advice against attempting to navigate the Salmon, known as the River of No Return. The mighty Snake River, another important waterway, has carved the deepest gorge in North America, which you well know as Hells Canyon.

Throughout the year, Idahoans will celebrate this momentous occasion in the State's history. Displays, pageants, balls, and other programs will remind the people of their rich heritage. At Caldwell, Idaho, for instance, the citizens are planning to run a stagecoach from that progressive city to what remains of the once flourishing mining town of Silver City. Last Saturday at Boise, Idaho's colors of blue, silver, and gold were used for the centennial ball spon-

sored by the Sons and Daughters of Idaho Pioneers. In our State capitol, a group of Idaho oldtime fiddlers serenaded the legislators with an old-fashioned hoedown.

Events such as these will be presented in many fashions in communities, both large and small, throughout the Gem State. I wish to extend a cordial invitation to my fellow colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to visit Idaho in 1963 and become a part of our territorial centennial celebration.

#### IDAHO TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, March 3 marks an important date in Idaho history books. It was on March 3 exactly 100 years ago that President Abraham Lincoln approved the Organic Act to establish and govern the Idaho Territory.

The act created a princely domain covering 325,000 square miles which was carved out of the Washington, Dakota, and Nebraska territories. It encompassed the area now approximately occupied by Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming and exceeded in area the present State of Texas by over 60,000 square miles.

The name, Idaho which freely translated means "Gem of the Mountains" or literally translated, "Behold, the sun coming down the mountain," was selected in preference to all other suggested names by U.S. Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts, who later became the Vice President of this great Nation.

During the past hundred years Idaho has had an illustrious and fascinating history. Today it is the home of the world famous Idaho potato but produces equally as good beef cattle, wheat, and many other products of the soil.

Idaho primarily is an agricultural State, on the threshold of industrial development and is a sportsman's paradise. The State has a great number of beautiful crystal clear streams and rivers which are well known the world over as outstanding fishing haunts, including Silver Creek. This creek has been described as the best fly fishing stream in America. Then there is the Salmon River which produces great numbers of salmon and steelhead to the fresh water angler annually and the Snake River which is famous as a trout stream throughout the West.

In addition, the lakes of northern Idaho are famous for their large trout. The State also has some of the finest hunting grounds in the continental United States with elk, moose, mountain sheep and goats, bear, and deer among the wild game that is hunted in the mountains of Idaho.

The snows of the fall turn a hiker's paradise into beautiful ski slopes with probably Sun Valley the best known of the ski areas in the State and the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent this great State that has so many natural beauties—the majestic mountains, crystal clear streams, wild game, fighting fish—and some of the finest people found anywhere in the world. Most of them are the descendants of pioneers who helped to carve the State from the territory that was created 100 years ago. As a result of their pioneering heritage, they retain their independence, their self-reliance and their friendliness.

I am sure that Americans everywhere would enjoy spending a few weeks in Idaho, but this year when all Idaho will be celebrating its territorial centennial there will be a special welcome to all visitors. I join with Idahoans everywhere in saying, "Come to Idaho, the Gem of the Mountains, partake of our hunting and fishing, our hospitality and help us celebrate our territorial centennial."

#### U.N. AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING FOR CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, are well acquainted with the term "pilot" project. We seem to be getting news of a good many pilot projects these days.

The Kennedy's Federal service corps for youth is a going thing under a pilot organization without any congressional authorization.

Many spending proposals are squeezed through this Congress as small experimental or pilot plans, only to balloon to gigantic proportions in later years.

And the United Nations is active in pilot projects, also. A number of these are in Communist nations both under and outside of the much-lamented Special Fund.

It is a United Nations pilot project in a Red nation which brings me before the House today.

An airplane pilot project.

Gentlemen, it is with deep regret and dismay that I inform the House that the taxpayers of America, through their subsidization of the United Nations, are scheduled to pay to teach Communist Cubans to learn to fly airplanes. Indeed, we already have paid, so that Cubans and Yugoslavs could learn about aircraft operations and maintenance.

In a small project, probably designed to get a U.N. boot in the door, the United Nations through its International Civil Aviation Organization has programed a \$17,280 grant to Castro Cuba that not only could send 12 Cuban officials to flying school, but also could instruct them in meteorology, air traffic control, and maintenance of radios, aircraft, and engines.

Just as in its plan to give agricultural aid to Cuba, the United Nations once again is working in direct opposition to whatever foreign policy we should have in the United States, and against the

best interests of the Latin American Republics. Yet, it is only with the continued massive financial support of the American taxpayers that the United Nations is able to remain solvent. Here again is that 40 percent we contribute to the Special Fund.

Under the proposed U.N. project the Cuban officials would be trained at the Mexico City Training Center of the International Civil Aviation Organization. That school—which came under Special Fund support in July 1961—trained some 300 students from Latin America in the 1961-62 period.

It teaches meteorology, air traffic control, radio, aircraft and engine maintenance, and flight operations. The aircraft used in training are the Piper Apache, Cessna 172, DC-3 and Hiller helicopter.

May I point out to this House that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am well aware of the uses of these aircraft in military operations, and it matters not to their military effectiveness whether the pilots and mechanics and air controllers were trained on planes configured for civilian operations. The Piper, Cessna and Hiller models are light aircraft that can be used for battlefield transport, for observation and for artillery fire direction, as our advisers in South Vietnam have so well proved. The old-faithful DC-3, of course, can and has done dozens of military jobs in past years including cargo and troop transport operations and the dropping of paratroops.

Need I point out to this House that just a few weeks ago two airplanes from Cuba fired upon an unarmed American shrimp boat?

Can there be any question but that training of Castro Cubans in flying operations does benefit Cuba in a military sense?

Who will say that a Cuban trained in air traffic control, in interpretation and prediction of the weather, in aircraft engine repair, or in radio maintenance will not be a valuable addition as a trooper and as an instructor in Fidel Castro's Red armed force, which if it never attacks the United States is already—today—attacking in a bits-and-pieces assault, the nations of Latin America?

The United Nations has seen fit to help Castro do this.

The Latin American nations have not yet protested, perhaps due to our faulting leadership.

The American taxpayers are to help pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot be allowed to continue. This still is a small program. But the principle is intolerable to Americans. We will not, we must not, pay to train our enemies.

In the period 1961-62 this same program was operated on a smaller scale by the United Nations. Training of six Cubans was programed at that time. Luckily for the United States only a small portion of the granted money was spent, and the U.S. State Department feels that few, if any, Cubans already have benefited from the program.

But we may not be so lucky in the 1963-64 period. Castro is not stupid

enough to turn down a chance to train key young men in aircraft techniques that lend themselves well to his guerrilla operations in Latin America—and all for free.

The U.S.S.R., as we know, runs Cuba. Russia must be getting a big kick out of the things communism is getting Americans to pay for, under the United Nations.

I also find that Communist Yugoslavia—which seems to get continuing preferential treatment from the U.N., and from our own State Department, was provided under the ICAO program in 1961-62 three aircraft maintenance instructors and one pilot instructor.

What these U.N. instructors did in Yugoslavia is revealed by this quotation from the 1962 annual report of the ICAO to the U.N. General Assembly:

They spent 2 months in Yugoslavia early in the year to assist in setting up maintenance procedures for the aircraft of Soviet manufacture operated by the national airline and in the selection of personnel to undergo further training in the U.S.S.R. \* \* \*

Now, I ask my colleagues, does that sound like the State Department's goal—wooing Yugoslavia away from Russian communism—is being served by this "second foreign policy" of ours administered by the United Nations?

It seems decidedly not.

And once again the name of Ghana crops up as that leftist leaning nation comes in for more U.N. aid at the expense of American taxpayers. That nation received in 1961 two air traffic service experts from ICAO. Ghana also was favored with helpers from the U.N. in the fields of "airworthiness procedures," and teletype maintenance.

Yugoslavia also came in for additional aid in the form of fellowships that enable students to train in civil air law, meteorology, airport engineering, radar, airworthiness, airport design, airline accounting, airport management, civil aviation administration, radio engineering and telecommunications. Some of this training by the U.N. was conducted in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers do not object to the general goals of the International Civil Aviation Organization. We are glad to help our sister republics in this hemisphere in development of air technicians—to the extent that our deficit budget will permit.

But this hemisphere has isolated Cuba.

Cuba has admitted an ideology alien to this free hemisphere.

American taxpayers are under no obligation to help the bearded and loud-mouthed Cuban dictator and his boss from the U.S.S.R. who keeps reminding us that the Communist aim is to bury us.

Many of the Members of this House have risen here to attack the Special Fund of the United Nations. Now we must turn our vigilance to the entire United Nations program. For this "pilot" project in Cuba is partly under the Special Fund and partly under the United Nations' Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

Unfortunately, this is not the only case of United Nations aid to Red Cuba. My



continuing investigation of this sorry situation has brought to light other instances of aid about which I will advise the House as final documentation of the programs is gathered.

*Distribution of ICAO expenditures under the expanded program by regions and states*

[In U.S. dollars]

	1961	1960	1959
<b>Africa:</b>			
Congo	8,000		
Ethiopia	98,336	106,379	84,103
Ghana	1,973		
Guinea	3,608	14,847	9,125
Liberia	11,865	2,841	
Mali	6,942		
Morocco	21,272	23,357	6,432
Senegal	11,200		
Sudan			7
Tanganyika	3,980		
Togo	19,863		
Tunisia	22,464	24,734	36,451
Subtotal	209,503	172,158	136,118
<b>Asia and the Far East:</b>			
Burma	2,350	1,900	11,095
Cambodia	16,181	19,740	18,550
China (Taiwan)			9,111
India	36,960	27,176	52,087
Indonesia	120,266	111,629	115,020
Japan	3,534	8,546	7,564
Korea, Republic of		4,600	9,705
Nepal	9,143		
Pakistan		2,049	22,014
Philippines	19,118	37,637	49,271
Thailand		43,607	32,870
Subtotal	207,552	256,884	327,287
<b>Europe:</b>			
Greece		25,998	44,961
Yugoslavia	11,065	15,221	4,600
Subtotal	11,065	41,219	49,561
<b>Latin America:</b>			
Argentina	16,831	16,867	16,387
Bolivia	15,049	9,428	4,476
Brazil	4,000		
British Honduras	342	2,220	2,352
Chile	20,092	6,392	6,732
Colombia		7,200	4,800
Costa Rica	18,108	500	5,088
Cuba	1,152	3,250	1,200
Dominican Republic			16,237
Ecuador	15,107	13,115	10,851
El Salvador	17,009	15,586	10,851
Guatemala	30,151	41,689	48,936
Haiti	17,512	12,399	
Honduras	28,239	3,517	6,302
Nicaragua	360	3,000	2,972
Panama	6,653		5,600
Paraguay	33,776	31,974	38,115
Peru	41,912	36,967	34,154
Venezuela	3,581	13,907	7,858
West Indies Federation	1,604		
Central America Air Navigation Services Corp.	5,615	20,599	11,999
Regional Latin America (Training Centre, Mexico City)	60,426	90,471	73,894
Subtotal	337,519	329,181	298,933
<b>Middle East:</b>			
Afghanistan	102,006	65,600	87,672
Iran	111,718	117,448	118,998
Iraq	64,498	52,171	32,207
Israel	2,228	14,734	34,743
Jordan	34,887	25,871	3,121
Lebanon	56,211	48,849	75,308
Saudi Arabia	47,461	19,724	13,012
Syrian Arab Republic			
United Arab Republic	50,159	49,722	48,663
Seminars on Forecasting	35,346		
Regional projects:			
Firefighting	14,645		
Flight safety	43,945	28,520	43,422
Frequency	26,522	9,724	16,151
Teletype maintenance	21,649	8,007	
Subtotal	649,751	487,746	522,191
Total for projects	1,415,390	1,287,188	1,334,090
Administrative costs	197,535	184,122	179,064
Exchange losses		12,447	15,583
Grand total	1,612,925	1,483,757	1,528,737

# SIXTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ROADBUILDERS' CONVENTION

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in February the American Roadbuilders' Association held its 61st annual convention at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Ill. One of the main speakers at the convention was the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, who is the ranking minority member of both the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Congressman CRAMER's remarks were informative and challenging, and I was particularly interested in his comments concerning toll traps on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. I am informed that at the present time the Illinois State Toll Highway Commission is seeking to direct Interstate Route 80 through collection gates on 8 miles of toll road near Chicago.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the full text of Congressman CRAMER's speech for the benefit of my colleagues who share my interest in the Federal-aid highway program.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. CRAMER AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Two years ago, at the beginning of the 87th Congress, the problems confronting the highway program were grave, difficult, and, in some cases, highly controversial. The problems were largely financial. It had become obvious that the receipts of the highway trust fund would not be sufficient to continue the Federal-aid highway program on an orderly basis under existing and anticipated authorizations. Furthermore, the latest estimates of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways made it clear that additional Federal funds would have to be provided in order to complete the Interstate System as originally planned.

In a fine display of bipartisan effort, which has become traditional in Federal-aid highway legislation, the 87th Congress enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1961 and 1962, which provided solutions to most of the financial problems, continued the highway program on an orderly basis, and added certain modifications and revisions to the Federal-aid highway laws.

Fortunately, the 88th Congress is not confronted with these difficult and controversial financial problems. It is still too early in the first session of this Congress to make a detailed analysis of the proposed legislation which will be considered. But it is a certainty that many bills affecting the Federal-aid highway program will be introduced, considered, and possibly enacted by the 88th Congress.

Today, I want to discuss three matters which certainly will be considered by the 88th Congress and which I believe are of the greatest importance. First, the geometric standards for the construction of interstate highways. Second, the extent to which toll roads—toll traps—are being inserted into the supposedly toll-free Inter-

state Highway System. Third, the occurrence of fraud, dishonesty, and incompetence in the highway program.

When the Interstate Highway program was started in 1956, we visualized a complete nationwide system of highways, adequate to accommodate the traffic anticipated for years in the future. Too often, in the past, had highways become congested and overloaded shortly after their construction simply because the volume of traffic which would use the highway had been badly underestimated. Determined to avoid this, the Congress required that the Interstate System be constructed to standards adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. At the time this provision of law was enacted, in 1956, it seemed that this 19-year anticipated use period was a reasonable, perhaps even a generous provision.

However, the Bureau of Public Roads has interpreted this as a limiting factor on the design of interstate highways. The law has been interpreted to mean that interstate funds can be expended to build a highway which will accommodate traffic forecast for 1975, but cannot be expended for additional lanes and other facilities to handle the additional traffic which is expected to develop in later years. In other words, the traffic volume forecast in 1963 for 1975, a spread of 12 years, is used for interstate highway design purposes, even though it may be known that the traffic which will develop by 1980, a spread of 17 years, will require a larger facility.

It is generally accepted that fairly accurate traffic forecasts can be made for approximately 20 years in the future. Such forecasts are frequently used as the basis for designing primary and secondary highways. However, on interstate highways, the design is based on traffic forecasts for the year 1975—now only 12 years away. The Interstate and Defense Highway System, which was supposed to be of unquestioned adequacy, is being designed on the basis of less advanced traffic forecasts than many of our less important highways.

This can lead to very undesirable and uneconomical results. Suppose that traffic forecasts as of 1963 indicate that a four-lane highway will handle the traffic anticipated for 1975, but that a six-lane highway will be needed by 1980. Obviously, the economical thing to do is to build four lanes now, but make provision for two additional lanes in the future. Rights of way adequate to accommodate six lanes should be purchased. Interchanges, bridges and separation structures, and drainage facilities should be constructed to six lanes, or so designed and constructed that they can be easily and economically widened in the future.

However, as the present law has been interpreted, Federal-aid interstate highway funds cannot be used to provide for these future needs. And, in many cases, the States lack the necessary funds to pay the additional cost. The result is that some interstate highways may be built with the knowledge that within a very short time expensive and uneconomical projects will have to be undertaken to expand the facility and the adequacy of the project for future use is limited to 12 years, a period that decreases as each year passes between now and 1975.

This problem was not critical in 1956. At the present time, 1963, it has become quite critical. And as time goes on, it will be more and more serious. As the law is now interpreted, in 1972 interstate highways will be designed to accommodate traffic forecast for only 3 years in the future.

It seems obvious that something should be done to solve this problem but quite frankly, I am not sure just what the solution is. One proposed answer is to simply change the law to require interstate highways to be designed

to accommodate traffic forecast for 20 years after the date of construction. However, this deceptively simple solution has some very troublesome aspects. Many miles of Interstate highways have been already built to 1975 standards, and most of this mileage is in States which have advanced the program most diligently. To amend the law now so as to permit the construction of interstate highways to higher standards would be to penalize the more advanced States, and give inequitable benefits to those States which have lagged. Providing additional funds to assist the advanced States to improve the earlier interstate highways would create difficult financial problems.

Whatever may be the best solution, it is essential that the Congress take early action. We are now only 10 years away from the end of the program, and every day that goes by makes the problem more serious.

Secondly, since 1921, Federal law has required that all highways constructed with the aid of Federal funds be free of tolls of all kinds with certain exceptions in the case of toll bridges and tunnels. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which provided for construction of the Interstate System with Federal funds paying 90 percent of its cost, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to approve, as part of the Interstate System, toll roads which meet the geometric and construction standards adopted for that system. This provision was designed to avoid the economic waste that could result if toll-free highways were constructed to duplicate the service provided by toll roads. I believe this provision has been distorted and abused.

Since 1956, more than 2,200 miles of toll roads in 17 States have been approved as parts of the Interstate System. Some other States are even now constructing or contemplating the construction of additional toll road sections of the Interstate System, which were not planned as toll roads in 1956.

In my opinion, the legislative history indicates that the Congress intended the provisions of the 1956 act to apply only to toll roads then in operation, under construction or authorized, and not to authorize the future substitution of newly conceived toll roads for toll free highways on the Interstate System. The unrestrained placing of unjustified toll traps on the Interstate System is not, in my opinion, either in the public interest nor in accord with the intent of the Congress.

Let us examine the effects of inserting toll sections into the generally toll-free Interstate System.

I mentioned that more than 2,200 miles of toll roads have been approved as part of the Interstate System, most of them planned or in existence when the 1956 act was passed. This is a little more than 5 percent of the total 41,000 mile system. However, these 2,200 miles obviously have been placed in the most heavily traveled traffic corridors, and thus affect a much greater percentage of Interstate System traffic. And, although Federal funds do not participate in the cost of constructing toll roads, Federal funds do participate in the cost of constructing the highways which funnel interstate highway traffic into these facilities, and when this is the planned purpose, they become toll traps.

Now, we are concerned with future toll traps. Now the costs of toll road travel to the individual motorist becomes relevant in considering these new toll traps. Obviously, he must pay twice: once in highway user taxes, and once in tolls. But what does this mean in cold, hard dollars? The Bureau of Public Roads has calculated that the cost per mile of operating a fairly typical 4-door sedan is about 10 cents per mile, of which State and Federal highway user taxes comprise about 1.17 cents. These taxes are paid whether the motorist is traveling on a toll road or a toll-free highway. Toll charges on the major toll roads range from about 1.09

cents per mile on the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike, to 2.25 cents per mile on the West Virginia Turnpike. The latter, incidentally, is scheduled for future integration into the Interstate System. For the average motorist driving, let's say, 100 miles, these figures mean this: On a toll-free highway, the motorist will pay \$1.17 in highway user taxes. On the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike he will pay the same \$1.17 plus \$1.09 in tolls—a total of \$2.26 for the same distance. On the West Virginia Turnpike he will pay \$1.17 in highway user taxes plus \$2.25 in tolls, or a total of \$3.42, or nearly three times as much as on a toll-free highway, for a 100-mile trip.

Let us view this from a different standpoint. As you know, the Federal tax on gasoline is 4 cents per gallon, while the average State tax is about 6 cents per gallon—a total of roughly 10 cents per gallon. The toll charge on the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike, the lowest on any major toll road in the country, is equivalent to an additional gasoline tax of approximately 16 cents per gallon, computed on the basis of a typical passenger car traveling 15 miles per gallon of gasoline. On the West Virginia Turnpike, to be integrated into the interstate system after juggling the interstate routes to accomplish this, the toll charge is equivalent to an additional gasoline tax of about 33.7 cents per gallon for the same type of vehicle.

Now, how about the relevant comparative cost of constructing toll roads as compared to free roads. Ordinarily toll facilities are financed through the issuance of revenue bonds. Of all methods of financing highway construction, revenue bonds for toll facilities are the most expensive. The Chesapeake Bay bridge-tunnel facility near Norfolk, Va., will cost about \$139 million to build. But the users of this toll facility will have to pay an added \$345 million in interest and financing costs—a total of \$484 million for a facility which will be constructed for less than one-third that amount. In my own State of Florida, a proposed extension of the Sunshine State Parkway will cost \$76.4 million to build. But financing costs bring the total bill to \$169.5 million.

I fail to see any real justification for assuming such exorbitant additional costs for toll traps that could be financed as free roads on the Interstate System, after all, in 1960, the States certified to the Congress that they could finish the system as free roads if Congress provided the money—which Congress did. Federal funds are thus available to pay 90 percent of the cost of toll-free Interstate Highways.

It has been stated by some as a justification for toll traps that Federal funds are not apportioned rapidly enough to permit the early construction of badly needed Interstate Highway facilities, and in order to provide a highway now rather than several years in the future, toll revenue financing is necessary. This is not very convincing. Many States, faced with a shortage of highway funds, have constructed toll-free highways with the proceeds of general obligation anticipation of revenue bonds at a much lower cost than would have resulted from revenue-bond-financed toll roads. This anticipated financing is provided for under section 122 of title 23 of the U.S. Code. These bonds are paid for out of future funds due and anticipated. The Bureau of Public Roads has published figures concerning the bond financing programs of five States which issued both revenue bonds and general or limited obligation bonds for highway purposes. These figures show that savings of from 65 to 78 percent of financing costs were realized when general or limited obligation bonds were issued rather than revenue bonds.

Perhaps even more important than cost to the public and to the individual motorist is the effect of toll roads on the construction

of other highways in the area. Highway officials are reluctant to construct highways which might divert traffic from a toll road and thus reduce its revenues and often over-emphasize feeder roads serving toll roads, giving them priority treatment and neglecting other needed highways. The Bureau of Public Roads has adopted the official policy that it will not permit Federal-aid interstate funds to participate in the construction of a highway which will compete with and thus jeopardize the financial security of a toll road.

In my own State of Florida, the State road department has agreed to defer needed highway improvements even in the Cape Canaveral area in order to channel traffic into the Sunshine State Parkway. It announced that its official policy was to construct and improve all roads in the State:

"Except when the construction of any competing highway, or the improvement of any existing highway paralleling any portion of the existing parkway or of the aforesaid extension, in the same traffic corridor, would reduce the driving time or improve the convenience to such an extent that through traffic which might otherwise use the parkway or the aforesaid extension would be substantially diverted therefrom."

One additional aspect of this matter must be mentioned. Federal funds cannot participate in the cost of toll roads. However, they can and are used in the cost of constructing highways which funnel traffic into toll roads. This has led to the insertion of far too many toll traps into our supposedly toll-free Federal-aid Interstate Highway System. For just one example, the New England section of the New York State Thruway is 11.5 miles long, and the southerly 2.6 miles and northerly 5.3 miles were constructed with Federal-aid funds. The middle section, 3.6 miles long, was financed with other funds, and a tollgate is on this section. It is said that Federal participation in the northerly and southerly sections of this facility was legal, because the tollgate can be bypassed by use of local roads. However, to a motorist not familiar with the area, the New England section of the New York State Thruway is a single 11.5-mile facility, he travels its entire length and pays a toll—despite the fact that more than two-thirds of the length of the highway was financed with Federal-aid funds, and highways financed with Federal-aid funds are supposed to be free of tolls of all kinds.

In my opinion, this purposeful insertion of new toll traps not planned by 1956 is a distortion of the plain meaning of the 1956 law, and was not the intent of the Congress. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 3494) which would prohibit future toll facility construction on the Interstate System unless there is an affirmative finding by the Secretary of Commerce that it is in the public interest to build a toll rather than toll-free facility and to make this decision subject to congressional review. I feel strongly that this is important and urgently needed legislation, and intend to press for early congressional action.

Lastly, some comments on the distasteful subject of fraud, dishonesty and incompetence in the highway program. I assume that you are familiar with the shocking disclosures which have been made by the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am the ranking minority member.

So far the subcommittee has held public hearings with respect to practices in five States: Oklahoma, Florida, New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia. It was found that certain serious deficiencies and irregularities existed or had occurred in all of these States.

The findings, which were established by conclusive proof, included examples of these: Deplorable failure to meet construction



specifications; little or no testing, inspections, or supervision; actual falsification of test reports and samples; conflicts of interest on the part of highway department officials; payments of cash and other things of value by highway contractors to State employees who were responsible for inspecting and supervising the contractors' work; improvements on rights-of-way which had been purchased with public funds and had to be removed to permit highway construction being turned over to contractors, who sold them at huge windfall profits; payments of greatly excessive amounts for highway rights-of-way through pure incompetency of appraisers; and criminal conspiracy between State employees, appraisers, and attorneys resulting in payment of clearly inflated prices for right-of-way and sizable illicit profits by the conspirators.

We don't like to admit that these things occur. We have confidence in our highway program and highway officials, and most of us are proud of the part we may have played in building the finest highway system in the world. We comfort ourselves with the belief and knowledge that irregularities and dishonesty occur in only a small percentage of the cases, and that the vast majority of people involved in the highway program are honest, competent, dedicated persons. Even though this is true, and I am convinced that it is true, the fact remains that dishonesty and incompetency do exist and cannot be condoned or tolerated.

Every person involved in the highway program—highway officials, contractors, material suppliers, engineers, attorneys, appraisers, and the rest—must not only be personally honest, but must do everything possible to assure that his associates are doing their job honestly and properly. I am afraid that in too many places it is being said, "The irregularities disclosed in those other States are shameful—but can't happen here." But the fact of the matter is that it can and very possibly has happened here.

A friend of mine put his finger on the problem, I think, when he observed, "It's hard to be suspicious of a friend." It is hard to be suspicious of people that you have known, liked and worked with for a long time. But the cases of dishonesty and incompetency revealed in congressional hearings occurred largely because honest, competent people assumed that everybody else was equally honest and competent, and therefore did not review the work of their subordinates or associates carefully or critically. They accepted everything at face value, and thus created the opportunity for fraud.

I am not suggesting that we establish a spy system, where nobody trusts anybody. I am saying that we should not take everything for granted. We should not blindly accept a statement or certification that a job has been done. We must make some inquiry or examination to assure that the job has actually been done and done properly. This is the only way that we can minimize the opportunity for fraud and incompetency, and have some assurance that dishonesty will be promptly detected and punished.

All of us know that much has been done already to tighten procedures and minimize the opportunity for fraud. But it is not sufficient that we simply take action in that direction and stop. We must make the public aware of the fact that such action has been taken, and that the program, fairly clean in the past, will be more so in the future.

I have heard it said many times that the banking industry is not threatened or attacked simply because a cashier embezzles money or a bank official absconds with the day's deposits. I think that this is true because the American public is satisfied that the banking industry has established proper

safeguards, and that thievery occurs in only rare, isolated instances. In other words, the banking industry has convinced the people that it has done everything it can to protect its patrons.

The highway people must do the same. We complain that frauds make the headlines, while accomplishments are never considered newsworthy. Unfortunately, this seems to be one of the facts of life, and there is not much we can do about it. However, if we can convince the public that we have taken vigorous, affirmative action to eliminate fraud and incompetency, and are doing everything humanly possible to protect public funds, I believe the black headlines will be viewed with proper perspective. The public will be satisfied that cases of fraud and incompetency are the rare exception rather than the rule in the highway program.

It was partially for this reason that last session of Congress, and again this session, I introduced a bill (H.R. 2557) to strengthen and revise the Federal criminal laws relating to the Federal-aid highway program.

Briefly speaking, my bill would do the following:

1. It would prohibit donations to political parties or political candidates by individuals or firms contracting with the States on Federal-aid highway projects. Existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, contains such a prohibition with respect to Federal contracts. My bill would simply extend this to Federal-aid highway contracts which are generally State rather than Federal contracts, although Federal funds may bear from 50 to 95 percent of their cost.

2. My bill would prohibit reprehensible practices which we know have occurred with disturbing frequency: the practice of highway contractors giving money and other things of value to the highway department personnel responsible for inspecting or supervising the contractors' work, and the directly related practice of performing work or furnishing materials and equipment, or permitting the performance of work or furnishing materials or equipment other than as provided in the contract or applicable plans and specifications.

3. The bill contains provisions directed toward conflicts of interest. It would prohibit persons performing services for the highway departments (including highway department employees) from having a financial or other personal interest in Federal-aid highway contracts with respect to which they have performed such services. It would also require such persons to publicly disclose any interest they might have in any real property required for Federal-aid highway projects on which they worked or had an official responsibility.

4. The bill would revise and strengthen the existing law having to do with false statements and certifications concerning Federal-aid highway projects, by extending its terms to cover real property transactions.

The need for enactment of legislation covering these matters has become obvious, and I intend to press for early congressional action.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,  
Feb. 27, 1963]

CONGRESSMAN OPPOSES TOLL ROAD ADDITION  
CRAMER CITES BURDEN ON MOTORISTS  
(By Hal Foust)

Additions to the Nation's tollways, such as those planned in Illinois, were denounced yesterday by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, ranking minority member of the congressional Subcommittee on Roads.

In a speech before the American Road Builders Association Convention in the Palmer House, CRAMER declared that it was the intention of Congress in its 1956 enact-

ment of the 41,000-mile interstate program to incorporate the then existing 2,200 miles of tollways but not to accept any further mileage.

#### SEEK LEGISLATIVE AID

The Illinois Toll Commission is seeking legislative aid to extend its East-West route 95 miles from Aurora to Fulton at a cost of \$105 million. The commission also is seeking to put the Hammond-Rock Island (I-80) expressway, a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar freeway, through its collection gates on 8 miles of tollway in southern Cook County.

"The cost of travel to the individual motorist is relevant in considering new toll traps," CRAMER said. "The Federal Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the cost per mile for a typical family car is 10 cents, including 1.17 cents in Federal and State license fees and gasoline excises. These taxes apply whether the travel is on a toll road or a free road."

"Toll charges range from 1.09 cents per mile on the Pennsylvania Turnpike to 2.25 cents on the West Virginia Turnpike. In Pennsylvania, on the cheapest tollway in America, the motorist is paying the equivalent of an additional 16 cents a gallon. In West Virginia, the toll is the equivalent of an additional 33.7 cents a gallon."

#### BONDS MOST EXPENSIVE

On the Tri-State tollway bypassing Chicago, the toll is \$1.80 for 77 miles, which is the equivalent of an additional 35 cents a gallon tax for a car making 15 miles per gallon.

"Of all methods of financing highway construction," the Congressman continued, "revenue bonds for toll construction are the most expensive."

"The Illinois Toll Commission expects to collect \$1.7 billion revenue from its users before the retirement of the \$441 million in revenue bonds used to build the existing 187-mile system."

#### AFFECTS OTHER ROADS

"Perhaps even more important than cost to the public and to the individual motorist," CRAMER said, "is the effect of toll roads on construction of other highways in the area. Highway officials are reluctant to build freeways that will take traffic from tollways."

This reluctance on the part of Indiana is perpetuating a gap of 30 miles near Michigan City in the otherwise completed Chicago-Detroit freeway.

When Illinois adopted its tollway program, plans were postponed or canceled for modernizing Skokie Road as a freeway; an interstate route from Chicago through the Fox Lake and Lake Geneva region was killed; and a belt route around Chicago was removed from the Federal program.

#### COMMUNIST MILITARY PENETRATION OF THIS HEMISPHERE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Republicans who remain convinced that our resolution to deal firmly with Communist military penetration of this hemisphere is not and must not be based on political considerations. The great majority of Americans are for running Communists out of Cuba whether Republicans or Democrats.

Secretary of State Rusk says he is for it too, at least he gives the impression he is for it by saying that it continues to be America's policy that "Castro must go." But it is about time we had some action, Mr. Speaker. Informed sources among the military are deeply disturbed. So is the general public, and rightfully so.

I have repeatedly sought the use of force if needed to end Communist control of Cuba. This I have done regardless of the political complexion of the administration involved. On July 5, 1960, as chairman of the Committee on Internal Security of the National Association of Attorneys General of the United States, I submitted a report to the association at San Francisco, Calif., specifically urging the use of armed force if necessary "to prevent the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast." This was almost 3 years ago.

The report in which this recommendation was made is an extremely interesting document. It addressed itself to the acuteness of the problem of how to meet communism's challenge to our internal security, made substantially more difficult by the unnecessary language of a number of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

This report which continues to be of current interest and pressing importance was as follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JULY 5, 1960

In June 1957 the National Association of Attorneys General authorized the creation of a committee on internal security and instructed the committee "to confer immediately with interested Federal agencies and other national groups, including the American Bar Association, with a view to preparation of legislation for introduction at the current session of Congress designed to reaffirm and reactivate Federal and State internal security controls; and further authorized the committee, with the approval of the executive committee, to appear before Congress in support of its recommendations."

In June 1958, at the 52d annual conference, the National Association of Attorneys General resolved as follows:

"Be it resolved by the 52d annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, meeting in Chicago, Ill., on June 11, 1958, That the president is authorized to continue a committee on internal security and that the committee is authorized to communicate to the proper congressional committees the support and approval of the association for legislation to accomplish the following purposes:

"1. Reestablish the rights of States to enforce their subversive control laws by, in effect, amending the Smith Act to declare that it does not occupy the field to the exclusion of the States.

"2. Redefine the offense of teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government to indicate that the immediate probable effect of such action is immaterial, and further to provide that whenever intent to cause the overthrow is proved that the offense is established.

"3. To define the term 'organize' in the Smith Act to include the continuing organization and recruiting of members for subversive organizations and the formation or expansion of either new or existing units of subversive organizations."

At the time of the 1958 meeting a number of measures designed to effect the specific recommendations of your committee were pending in Congress. In February 1959 the American Bar Association through its house of delegates by an overwhelming vote adopted similar recommendations. On April 21, 1959, the chairman of the committee on internal security testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Internal Security, in support of these recommendations. A copy of this testimony was appended to the report of this committee submitted in May 1959 in New Orleans, La. As was then reported to this association:

"The legislative recommendations are simple. They are specific. They affirm congressional intention. They neither limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court nor do anything more than plug loopholes in existing internal security laws shown (to exist) by judicial decision. The need for State factfinding investigation complementary to the work of Federal committees is reflected in the position of the Department of Justice and Federal authorities, desirous of continued cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in this field. Transcripts of sworn testimony are a useful adjunct to the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which for all its splendid record has but a limited number of agents with a great many other things to do than deal with subversion and is without power to take testimony under oath, which is required for adequate survey of subversive activities.

"Your committee feels that in no respect does any of the legislation which has been recommended sanction abuse of process, interference with academic freedom, discrimination against teachers, undue interference with private rights, nor the pernicious practice of exposure for the sake of partisan political advantage. Contrariwise, it is believed that the power to investigate in fields in which there is power to legislate is vital to the manifest need to keep abreast of Communist and other subversive activity within the several States as a sensible precautionary measure in which the States and the Federal Government should work together. In addition to redefinition of the word organize and permission to the States to prohibit subversive activity by State law, it is felt that intentional criminal advocacy of overthrow of the Government of the United States or of any State by force and violence should be prohibited whether or not the advocacy at the time of utterance incites to the commission of an overt act. Lacking such an amendment, the Smith Act is now largely ineffective and opportunity is afforded for Communist indoctrination by intentional subversive advocacy within and without educational institutions across the land."

At the present time Congress has before it a number of measures designed to carry out these recommendations. In varying language all of the objectives have been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and some have passed either the House or the Senate but not both. A very considerable Senate committee disposition to recommend and enact legislation authorizing the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities (S. 294, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) lost considerable pressure for enactment in June 1959 with the Supreme Court decision in *Uphaus v. Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1090, 79 S. Ct. 1040, which was erroneously believed by many persons to have revitalized State sedition laws. While this decision was of considerable helpfulness in permitting State legislatures to investigate subversive activity within their States (including subversion directed toward the United States insofar as the same infringed upon the security and safety of the State) it reaffirmed the holding of *Commonwealth v. Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 100 L. Ed.

640, 76 S. Ct. 477, to the effect that State sedition laws were superseded by the Federal Smith Act to the extent the State laws attempted to make it a crime within the State to seek the overthrow of the Federal government by force, violence or other unlawful means.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to the foregoing measures, an omnibus bill offered by Senators Dobb and KEATING (S. 2652, 86th Cong., 2d. sess.) was reported from the Internal Security Subcommittee on September 7, 1959, and favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 30, 1960. It is now pending before the Senate.

Your committee would be something less than candid if it did not report that in this election year the prospects for enactment of this legislation are not bright. It is hoped that in the postelection period it will be possible for Congress to adopt the recommendations of this association in the field of internal security, which are relatively simple, urgently needed, and should not become embroiled in partisan political conflict.

At the 1959 meeting your committee was authorized in addition to keeping the association advised of the progress of the foregoing recommendations for congressional legislation, to note such other matters relating to internal security as may be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. It is difficult to define the periphery of "matters of interest or concern to this association in respect to internal security." It disturbs many of us that Congress has not reacted with more alacrity to the tremendous limitation of State power and authority implicit in the decision in *Commonwealth v. Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 100 L. ed. 640, 76 S. Ct. 477 Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, being very directly reflective of public sentiment, thus demonstrates more than ever the apathy, indifference, and lack of understanding that besets America in this field. Without doubt, eclipsing all other nonpolitical issues either domestic or international, the paramount problem of this time is whether communism and capitalism can live in one world in peaceful coexistence or are destined to clash in the death throes of hydrogen warfare. Tactical maneuvering by the Communists has warmed the cold war as this report is written, to a point where it is seriously urged that the United States maintain a 24-airborne, hydrogen and atomic bomb equipped air alert against the possibility of surprise Communist attack. Khrushchev's treatment of the President of the United States at the recent attempted Summit conference has beyond question materially increased world tensions but is of value in revealing the real Communist attitude toward this Nation.

It is impossible to assess the problem of internal security without regard to these international factors. This is for the reason that communism is international in scope and purpose and seeks the destruction of all free nations everywhere in the world by force and violence if other means fail. This objective with regard to the United States has never been clearer than in the propaganda of hatred toward the United States that is daily taught the youth of the Soviet Union and its satellites and by devious means is spread among the youth of other lands to inflame them against the American imperialists and warmongers. That such propaganda efforts can be successful has been proven last month in Japan. That it continues unabated is reported daily at intelligence levels within the U.S. Department of State, particularly in reference to Latin America and Mexico.

<sup>1</sup> A fundamental weakness of such a holding being, of course, that Communist conspiracy to destroy our system is not aimed at any particular government, either State or Federal, but at capitalist free America.



How much of the same pernicious propaganda is being distributed to young and old in this country is hard to know. The number of Communist-front groups and organizations infiltrated by Communists is reported by Federal committees to be substantial, each having its particular segment of the Communist mission reflecting the Communist Party line of the moment. How far such propaganda separately or cumulatively may contribute to persuade otherwise loyal American citizens to renounce that loyalty and to become agents for the Communist Party and agents for communism generally is impossible to assess. It is indisputable, however, that as this report is written there has been a recent noticeable resurgence of Communist activity both open and secret throughout the entire United States. That this was predictable was stated by your chairman when president of this association in Sun Valley in June 1957. The suggestion from sources that should know better that Communist activity in this country is some kind of lawful political activity privileged from surveillance by reason of the first amendment has noticeably emboldened and broadened written and spoken activity on the part of Communists throughout the United States.

We should all be grateful that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Barenblatt v. United States*, 260 U.S. 109 (June 1959), with reference to the Communist Party has now said that those who would claim that it was "just an ordinary political party from the standpoint of national security, is to ask this Court to blind itself to world affairs which have determined the whole course of our national policy since the close of World War II—and to the vast burdens which these conditions have entailed for the entire Nation."

Your committee believes that there is even more pressing present need to keep abreast of Communist activities throughout the Nation than existed 10 years ago. We are distressed by the apathy, the complacency, the indifference, and even the blindness of too many comfortably situated Americans who hear Khrushchev in Austria claim that the Communist Party line has eliminated force and violence but remain uneasily aware that throughout history every Communist leader since Karl Marx has said that war between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Your committee is strongly of the view that the internal security of each State would be materially improved by procedures designed to enable each State government to be kept advised of the nature and extent of the operations of Communists in that State. For such purposes the use of the subpoena power through legislative investigation is indispensable. In this view the committee is aware of the fact that Communist Party members have not carried cards for more than a decade. It also knows that many of the so-called intelligentsia who knowingly and intentionally work for and in behalf of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations have never assayed membership for reasons obvious. Your committee continues to be of the abiding conviction that every Communist in the United States is a potential security risk and that State and Federal policy should not fail to take due cognizance of this fact.

The relationship of the foregoing to the internal security of each State is clear. In this time no attorney general on behalf of any State can disregard within his State, Communist operations whatever they may be. As attorneys and members of the bar sworn to uphold the Constitution of State and Nation, it is our fundamental moral and legal responsibility to exert every lawful means to keep apprised of the machinations of those who would destroy our Constitution, our system, and our way of life.

Your committee recognizes that no amount of fixed doctrine nor Maginot-line-type of education can vest us with that vitality necessary to meet and defeat the challenge of communism without war. We also recognize that this challenge must be met and defeated without war or there will be little left in the world but chaos and destruction. Therefore, with confidence in the capacity of an intelligent and informed free citizenry to fashion a better panacea for tomorrow's citizens than can be offered by communism, and with confidence that the day will soon come when the courts will affirm in indisputably decisive language the principle that those who claim the priceless benefits of American citizenship and the protection of its laws owe to their State and Nation both moral and legal responsibility to answer relevant questioning relating to the security of our people, your committee reports that the internal security of the Nation is under continuing Communist stress which is being partially met by active State and Federal countermeasures. It is felt that a much larger complementary role in this struggle might be effectively waged by State agencies, and to the extent that each member of this association in his State can assist in this direction, he is respectfully urged to do so.

Most Americans are concerned by the developments in Cuba as well as in other less easily recognized locations in this hemisphere indicating intentional aggressive Communist penetration of what has always been heretofore considered a place of primary concern and control of the United States. It is shocking to see American properties and American citizens and companies pushed around and discriminated against by the Castro government while we stand by and just watch. Economic sanctions in such circumstances are not enough if this country or its citizens are to have any self-respect left. Nothing is perhaps accomplished by descriptive adjectives, but your committee is beginning to wonder whether the world thinks we are afraid to stand up for what we believe in.

To put off dealing firmly with a situation of outright Soviet military aid to the Castro government in Cuba is to mortgage the future day when a much worse problem is presented with Panama. In terms of the internal security of the United States—not solely of the State of Florida—it is simply intolerable that we should permit the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast even if it takes force to prevent it. The same principle applies to the unlawful thefts and discriminations by the Castro government against Americans in Cuba. The impetus to this new aggression is undeniable. How can any American be safe in any Caribbean travel if this Nation will not protect him against outlawry?

For many years the unpleasant moment which is now upon us has been foreseeably predictable from American policies which have deferred the day of reckoning by continued appeasement of Communist aggression.

Just as surely as this Nation misled Britain and France into believing that they might with our sanction use force to defend their interests against Nasser's taking of the Suez Canal, and misled the Hungarian people into believing we would help if they would rise up and rid themselves of communism's yoke, it is a certainty that we would use force to prevent the taking over of the Panama Canal should the Panamanian Government become too friendly with the Soviet Union, accept its aid and military supplies as Egypt has done, and attempt to seize it.

We should meet the Cuban aggression now. Latin America and the entire Caribbean are watching.

The conclusion is inescapable that the United States must be ready to risk war to keep hostile Communist military establishments out of this hemisphere. The heavy logistical burden of maintaining effective military defensive action in Indochina and other places in the Far East is not present with respect to operations in this hemisphere. Those who claim that if we can arm bases in Turkey the Communists have the right to do so in Cuba, are intellectually dishonest, for the mission, objective, and spiritual dedication of the American people as well as American policy is neither imperialist nor aggressive toward any other nation in the world, whereas Soviet communism aims at unlawful world domination and individual slavery by aggression and violence all over the world.

Neither in terms of international law nor in the field of propaganda is there merit to any charge that by acting to prevent such military preparations by a foreign enemy power in this hemisphere, we are imperialists. As Americans the United States seeks nothing other than a world in which freedom and equal justice under law will stand some reasonable assurance of continuing in peace. Such a position, properly explained to the peoples of the world, is all the moral sanction we need. If the Communists can get away with what is going on in Cuba in plain view, we stand (and deserve) to lose not only the respect but in all probability the support, of a great majority of the countries of Latin America.

No thorough contemporary assessment of our internal security in this time should fail to appraise the intrinsic will of the American people to fight to preserve the American way of life. Such an appraisal does not lend to optimism for the future safety of this Nation. The dedication and purpose with which many Communists approach the problems of the education and orientation of youth, application of their work, elimination of wasted time, and indoctrination in young and old of a single-mindedness of purpose toward a Communist world, is a caution for all of us in our opinion. While we should not endeavor to indoctrinate our youth with the same virus of hatred with which the youth of the Soviet Union and other countries are being infected toward this Nation as a germ warfarer and imperialist aggressor, nevertheless, it is of the first order of importance that the generation now being trained by us should be fully and completely aware of the nature, purposes and objectives of international Communism in relation to those of American constitutional government. Anything short of this is to send our younger generation into the world ill prepared to wage the struggle for the minds of mankind that reaches from the Congo to Oslo. It is not enough only to offer these explanations to our own youth. In the schools of the friendly nations of this world we must send our qualified representatives to tell the truth concerning the United States and its role as protector of freedom and individual liberty.

No State in this Union has internal security if the United States itself is insecure.

At this moment Communist enemy forces are actively at work aiding existing hostile nations and seeking to further encourage other younger nations now frenzied with nationalism by propagandizing them that America, like John Bull of old, is against their nationalism, and that the West seeks to prevent their independence.

Unilateral Western talks on disarmament are bound to be ineffective, as have been those spheres of United Nations activity that have required concurrence of the Soviet bloc. We can never disarm as long as the Soviet does not also do so. We can never safely disarm without contemporaneous full and complete inspection. The world is not

going to obtain such a commitment from Communists. In the meantime, the race toward the neutron bomb, the satellite mirror, and the military conquest of space goes on at the expense of the soundness of our fiscal structure.

For the immediate present there is little doubt that defense requires continued sorely needed U.S. billions even at the price of more deficit and a correspondingly weaker dollar, but one has only to project such a situation continued over the next two decades to arrive at the conclusion that short of that time some way must be found to stop it or the economic structure of the United States will be ruined—itsself a Communist objective.

If millions upon millions of young men and women now growing up throughout the world continue to be indoctrinated with communism's philosophy of the use of unlawful force, of class struggle, of hatred, of the justification for subversion in the name of a Communist world, of the justness of atheism and alleged soundness of the material concept of the explanation and derivation of the universe, it means only one thing for us within our lifetime—aggressive war upon this country. This is because young adults trained in this manner from earliest adolescence in their willingness to destroy will exceed even the banzai of the Kamikaze pilot in World War II who was sure he was on his way to Japanese heaven. These, with the many now in their forties in Japan and in Germany who also hate this Nation in the memory of the destruction heaped upon theirs in World War II, make the projection almost a dismal certainty.

Some say that the only way the people of this country will awake to the need for authorization of powerful and effective governmental action to combat further Communist aggression is an attack upon us. The price of this would be the infinite horrors of atomic destruction, for we would certainly retaliate. Short of the shock of an attack, some method must be found to jar Americans from their complacency and inspire them to authorize their legislatures and the Congress to firmly take those steps in our behalf that must be taken to make certain that not one additional inch of the earth's surface nor one additional citizen of the world's population, adult or juvenile, is added to the Soviet Communist bloc.

Along with such a governmental policy, if Americans traveling abroad conclusively demonstrate by word and deed that we are for peace, freedom, and justice for all, and that communism means individual slavery, we are bound to succeed, for ours is the more attractive package.

Only a blind man would disregard the situation now existing. Internal security in our States is inadequate. We should not delude ourselves to the contrary. Internal security is literally dependent on the external security of the United States itself.

We have implicit confidence that just as communism is atheistic and denies the existence of God, so are we and our allies essentially law-abiding, God-fearing men and women. If Divine Providence and the omnipotence of Almighty God are to be made manifest upon this earth in our time it must mean that in this struggle we will win. Faith alone, however, is not enough. Strength in meeting any public challenge to American authority is indispensable.

As attorneys general let us as one firmly reject any governmental policy, State or Federal, that includes further appeasement or equivocation in dealing with Communist aggression. In firmness reflecting our genuine concern for the peace and security of the world will be found the only sure road to an honorable peace which will result from aggressors' unwillingness to face the show-

down if we stand firm. The hour is late but not too late.

If we continue to show an incredulous world that we are unwilling to fight to preserve our freedom or that of our allies, the balance of world power will swing to the Soviet Union. Should this happen, we predict that whether resulting from ultimatum or secretly in the night, The United States will suffer a major and terrible attack—an avoidable catastrophe if we have the courage now to stand firmly for freedom.

Your committee respectfully recommends that the committee on internal security be continued, instructed, and authorized to keep the association advised of the progress of the association's recommendations for legislation in the field of internal security and of such other matters relating to internal security as may in the opinion of the committee, be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. The chairman has been authorized to prepare and deliver to the resolutions committee a resolution to this effect.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the concepts expressed in this report will soon become an integral part of American policy.

#### HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday on the floor of the House, I revealed that during 1962 there had been a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China as reported in the annual report of the Panama Canal Company. At that time, I indicated that I had written the President of the United States urging prompt consideration of the advisability of denying the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels trading with Cuba. At that time, I further urged a study of this question by the House of Representatives. Today I rise to report that I am introducing a House resolution which it is hoped will provide the impetus to bring about such a study by the appropriate committee of the House.

The resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels engaged in trade with Cuba.

Since the rise of Castro, there has been, to my knowledge, little or no consideration of the possibility of denying the use of the Panama Canal to ships trading with Cuba. In view of the above report that during 1962 there was a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the canal to Red China and a 48-percent increase to Russia, and in view of the fact that CIA Chief John A. McCone, in his February 19 statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee emphasized the increasingly serious

problem of subversion spreading from Cuba to South America and stated that at least 1,000 to 1,500 South Americans went to Cuba in 1962 for sabotage and guerrilla training, with more going this year, I consider such a study necessary—without delay.

Our goal must be to weaken the Castro regime, to prevent the spread of communism from Cuba to the continent of South America, and, hopefully, to bring about the eventual downfall of the Castro dictatorship. I do not suggest that I am an expert on Cuban or South American affairs. However, from a study of a map of this hemisphere, it seems logical to predict that once the Communists have established a firm position on the continent of South America, we will have lost in large part the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents as a method of preventing the strengthening of communism in this hemisphere. Today the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism: tomorrow it may not.

The situation today represents a major danger to all of the American nations. Its solution will require the United States to assume and maintain a capacity of leadership, with the cooperation of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to the extent possible. This is not, in my opinion, saber rattling. A leadership vacuum exists, and we must fill it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are obstacles to restricting the use of the Panama Canal. We have treaties with Panama—the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Convention of 1903—and with Great Britain—the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901—to mention two. However, if, after study, it is considered desirable to deny the use of the canal to vessels trading with Cuba, there are ways to do it. If it is impossible under existing agreements, these agreements can be revised, as they have been before. We can ask the cooperation of the Organization of American States. We can consider extending our right to deny the use of U.S. ports to include those ports at either end of the canal. We can consider the possibility of liberally interpreting these treaties of the early 1900's to permit such action in view of the cold war of 1963.

Regrettably, we have lost much of the advantage we held some months ago. To wait further could result, within a matter of months, in having communism firmly established on the continent of South America. We cannot afford four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere. I urge prompt consideration of this resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a column from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 1, discussing Communist trade through the canal, and an editorial from the Chicago's American of February 25, concerning the recent OAS report urging the individual member nations to invoke the 1948 Rio Treaty for their mutual defense against Communist Cuba. I also refer the



Members of the House to the recent testimony of CIA Chief John McCone, before the Foreign Affairs Committee for a discussion of the seriousness of the problem of Communist subversion in South America:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Chicago's American, Feb. 25, 1963]

#### WARNING TO THE OAS

A report just made public by the Organization of American States soberly warns that individual member nations can no longer defend themselves adequately against the threat of Communist Cuba, and urges them to invoke the 1948 Rio treaty for mutual defense.

The report was submitted by a special 7-man study group and is "advisory," meaning that it doesn't have official OAS approval. Getting it adopted will involve many a wrangle, since some of its recommendations—for instance, breaking off all hemisphere relations with the Castro government—are still regarded as controversial by some member states. But the United States and other governments aware of the danger should press hard for approval; there isn't much time to spare.

What has been revealed of the report is restrained and factual, and does not indulge in nightmares. It points out that Castro and the Soviets have developed in Cuba a "political-military apparatus" which is expressly designed to get around the haphazard security measures now in force. Against the Communists' highly engineered techniques of subversion and agitation, the hemisphere's defenses aren't much beyond what they were in 1948, and are simply not adequate for the job.

One sorely needed element, the report said, is coordination of intelligence and counterespionage work among the hemisphere's free nations. Without that, they won't have the means to plan and carry out joint action. The report also called for organizing, equipping, and training security forces of the American republics to counter subversion and guerilla activity directed from Cuba.

This does not mean that the United States should rely wholly on cooperative action against Cuba. As Defense Secretary McNamara said last week in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, it is United States policy to eliminate Castros and communism from Cuba, and that's a job that will have to be handled principally by this country.

But the United States cannot police the rest of the hemisphere against subversion and guerrilla attacks. That will be up to the governments involved—and they'd better get together fast on ways to do it.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 1, 1963]

#### HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Red China and Soviet Russia are making very good use of the Panama Canal in efforts to bulwark Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

The 1962 report of the board of directors of the Panama Canal Co. contains, on page 6, the following statement:

"Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year (1962) was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba."

Undoubtedly, Nikita Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung and Castro fully appreciate the use of this American-built and American-operated

facility which helps them to carry out their Caribbean designs without the necessity for the long and expensive sea voyage around South America. The fact that the Panama Canal Co., which operates the canal for its owners, the taxpayers of the United States, spent \$16,100,000 to improve the canal in 1962 probably causes them to rejoice also.

Ships which transit the canal are required to pay for its use. Such payments are, no doubt, a bit of a load on the Cuban economy. But now that the traffic has been called to Washington's attention efforts will no doubt be made to remit the tolls on these shipments. Such action would be in line with the solicitous manner in which U.S. policy in respect to Castro's Cuba is currently conducted.

Why the United States should permit use of its facilities to undermine its position in the Caribbean is difficult to comprehend.

The statement that we are obligated by treaty and international law to permit transit of the canal by the ships of all nations is not a sufficient answer.

The United States doesn't recognize Red China. Treaties and international laws and practices which may be binding upon the United States insofar as other nations are concerned are not applicable to Red China. The United States has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. There may be a technical distinction between nonrecognition and the current status of United States-Cuban relations. That point is moot. If, however, the United States has the right to deny use of American ports to foreign ships engaged in the Cuban traffic, a right it has asserted, it can find ample legal grounds on which to deny use of the Panama Canal and its facilities, including the harbors, to the ships engaged in this particular traffic.

The ships engaged in the Sino-Soviet-Cuban traffic fly many flags. Those three Communist countries have relatively small merchant marines. Much of the traffic is carried in Greek, British, Norwegian, Lebanese, Japanese, Polish and Yugoslav bottoms. These also should be forbidden use of the canal's facilities for this particular traffic.

If the American Government doesn't intend to employ every economic tool it has to bring about Castro's downfall it shouldn't announce such policies; halfway measures, such as it now engages in, are worse than none at all.

Since the ending of World War II Panama Canal traffic has increased 212 percent. In 1962 canal shipments between Red China and Cuba increased 600 percent over 1961. This huge increase gives some measure of the use to which this American-built, American-operated facility is being employed to thwart American policy in respect to Castro's Cuba.

The United States stopped buying Cuban sugar for the sole purpose of wrecking that island's economy and, in so doing, bringing about Castro's downfall. To prevent that downfall, Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals. As noted in the 1962 report of the Panama Canal Co., sugar shipments from Cuba to Red China and Soviet Russia "accounted for the vast majority of this (increase) combined tonnage."

This is but another example of the fact that the United States, as a consequence of inept policies and implementation, does more to defeat itself than all the Communist nations combined.

#### RESOLUTION TO PREVENT U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS FROM BEING USED FOR ASSISTANCE TO CUBA

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a resolution to the Congress to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba. The resolution provides that if the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance or the United Nations Special Fund hereafter provides any assistance, directly or indirectly, to Cuba, then the maximum U.S. contribution which may be made to that program or Fund, as the case may be, for the next calendar year shall be reduced by the amount spent by such program or Fund in providing such assistance to Cuba.

The recent decision by the U.N. Directorate to extend \$1,157,600 from the United Nations Special Fund for a 5-year project intended to diversify Cuban agriculture reveals the need for such a joint congressional resolution. U.S. officials strongly opposed the project, which was first considered in May, 1961, when it came up again before the Special Fund several weeks ago. It was argued that the likelihood of success for such a project was considerably less than when the project was first approved because of the increasing chaos, in fact the utter disorganization, of Cuban agriculture caused by Castro's follies. It was pointed out that some of Cuba's best agricultural experts had fled the country, that food production was in trouble, in short, that Castro's dictatorial hand and his inept policies were reflected throughout the agricultural sector. Foreign agents—Soviet agricultural experts—were replacing native technicians. And yet, the Special Fund was not convinced by these arguments. The old contention that the extension of assistance must be decided on the basis of project feasibility alone—and that political considerations must play no part—was once again dragged out in support of the United Nations action. But do not these facts—the disorganization of Cuban agriculture, the inept agricultural policies of the Castro government, the presence of large numbers of Soviet agents—challenge the feasibility of the United Nations scheme?

Furthermore, Castro has not been noted for his cooperation with the United Nations in the past. He blocked the recent United States-Soviet negotiations on the crisis caused by the Soviet military buildup in Cuba at every point. He refused to allow United Nations inspectors on Cuban soil to verify the removal of Soviet offensive weapons. When Secretary General U Thant attempted to mediate in the crisis, Castro adamantly denied him every point. He alleged that Soviet bombers belonged to Cuba and could not be withdrawn without his consent. In short, Castro has failed to cooperate with the United Nations in political settlements in the past. Why should he now be granted Special Fund assistance? What guarantee is there that once United Nations experts arrive, Castro will aid their efforts? What about the Soviet agricultural experts? Will they and the U.N. technicians work hand in hand? The answers

to these questions are vital to the feasibility of the project. The question marks are surely numerous enough to have made the Directorate think twice and then a third time before extending assistance to Castro.

Granted, these questions also involve political considerations, but political considerations of a sort which must be taken into account, I contend, in deciding upon any United Nations activity. The Special Fund criteria for determining what projects may be approved deny inclusion of political considerations. But what is meant by political considerations—the attempt of any one government or group of governments to influence a decision on the basis of its own, or their own, self-interest rather than in terms of the usefulness of the project to the country concerned and its chances for success? In the case of U.N. assistance to Cuba there are political considerations of a different sort—political considerations which touch upon not the relations of individual states with Cuba, but the relationship of international organizations, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations itself.

In the eyes of all Latin America, Castro is an outlaw in the Western Hemisphere who is trying to subvert democratic governments throughout the hemisphere. The OAS declared him persona non grata in the inter-American system when the foreign ministers voted to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. Currently the OAS has undertaken a thorough study of the means by which Castro is attempting to infiltrate Latin America and spread the gospel of communism. All Castro's actions—repression within Cuba, subversion without—contravene the cooperative and collective security bases of the Organization of American States. Castro is a threat to the hemisphere, a barrier to the cooperative efforts of the inter-American community, and an outlaw in the inter-American security system. Does he deserve international assistance? Can such assistance be justified in view of Castro's unlawful actions in the Western Hemisphere?

The same political considerations arise with regard to the United Nations itself. Castro's oppressive policies within Cuba—the execution of political prisoners, the forcing of thousands of citizens into exile, the denial of individual freedoms—make a mockery of United Nations efforts in the field of human rights. How can the world organization on the one hand spend years formulating basic codes of human rights in order to improve the condition of man throughout the world and on the other hand lend its assistance to a government which is flagrantly flouting basic individual freedoms? Furthermore, the chief purpose of the United Nations is preservation of peace and security; it was established as a collective security organization explicitly dedicated to deterring aggression. Yet, on this score, too, Castro is guilty. He allowed Cuba to become an open Soviet military base; he turned his island into a bridgehead of covert

Soviet penetration in the Western Hemisphere. How can the United Nations extend assistance to a government which is subverting the basic purposes of the world organization, which is dedicated not to maintaining international peace and security but to deterring international peace and security?

Even more basic than these questions insofar as the U.S. Congress is concerned is the relationship between the United States and the United Nations, for it is in this area that the Congress can make itself heard. If the United Nations will not listen to the dictates of reason and justice, if it will not exert some sense of discrimination between a foolish and a wise course of action, if it will not accept its responsibility as an organization dedicated to the collective security of the world and the betterment of man's lot, the U.S. Congress can do nothing. It can only point out insufficiencies; it can only hope that wiser counsels will prevail in the future.

But as one of the branches of government engaged in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy, Congress has the right, and the duty, to make its will felt in the area of relations between the United States and the United Nations. It is in this spirit that the resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba was placed before the Congress. It is from a sense of responsibility for the foreign policy of the United States that the Congress is suggesting the President reduce future U.S. contributions to the U.N. or its agencies, in the event such contributions will be used for assistance to Cuba.

Paul Hoffmann, the Managing Director of the Special Fund and an American himself, it is true, has promised that no U.S. funds will be used on the Cuban project and that no U.S. technicians will be sent to Cuba. But this does not get at the root of the problem. For one thing, the substantial U.S. contribution to the Special Fund—\$28 million for 1963—will release other funds that can then be diverted to the Cuban project. Furthermore, Mr. Hoffmann's promise does not resolve future difficulties, future instances in which the United Nations may allocate assistance to Cuba. The problem is rather that the action of the U.N. Directorate in authorizing the agricultural assistance project for Cuba was in direct contravention of U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba. The United States, along with the rest of the Western Hemisphere, has declared itself the enemy of the Castro government. We are dedicated to weakening Castro's economic and political position in order to open the way for the establishment of a democratic government in Cuba. We have been attempting to put the economic squeeze on Castro—through the withdrawal of sugar quotas, the elimination of trade. We have urged our friends to do the same. The United Nations action, designed to improve Castro's agricultural sector, if successful, would strengthen rather than weaken Castro's position and is therefore in direct opposition to the avowed policy of the United States toward Cuba. If the United States suc-

cumbs quietly to the United Nations position, we are letting the United Nations make our foreign policy for us—and a foreign policy which, in this case, is far different from that which we have time and again stated we are pursuing with regard to Cuba. The U.S. Congress cannot allow the United Nations to take over the function of formulating U.S. foreign policy.

We feel too that it was impolitic of the United Nations to overlook the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the total contributions to the Special Fund for the year 1963, some \$28 million. While it may be true that the basis of the United Nations is the equality of member states as reflected in the one-state one-vote General Assembly, only too often the equality factor is overemphasized and it is forgotten that the great powers were given a preferred position in the world organization. The permanent member veto in the Security Council acknowledged that the powers had a special responsibility and that therefore they ought to have a special privilege in the United Nations. Should not some form of recognition be given to the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources, over 32 percent of the U.N. regular budget, and a major portion of the Congo operations? The United States has poured considerable financial resources into the United Nations. It has bailed the United Nations out of financial trouble. Just last summer the U.S. Congress authorized the President to purchase up to one-half of the total issue of U.N. bonds to finance peacekeeping operations. Should the United Nations not have listened a little more carefully to U.S. objections concerning assistance to Cuba?

The United States cannot support, cannot be asked to contribute financial resources, to a project which subverts its own foreign policy. The United Nations is dependent on U.S. contributions. It could not continue to exist if U.S. funds were withdrawn. May the Cuban assistance controversy be a lesson to the United Nations that it cannot ignore the basic foreign policy position of one of its chief contributing members. The resolution before you, if adopted, would insure that U.S. money will never be used by the United Nations to subvert U.S. foreign policy in Cuba. It would assure that our foreign policy toward Cuba will continue to be formulated in Washington and not at the United Nations in New York.

Contributions to the U.N. Special Fund are not based on a schedule of assessments; they are entirely voluntary. Each year governments pledge their contributions to the Special Fund for the current year at a U.N. conference convened for this purpose. Thus, the loss of voting sanctions of article 19 of the charter, which pertain only to assessed contributions, do not apply to Special Fund contributions.

The following statistics setting forth the amount of U.S. contributions to the Special Fund, as well as pledges by Soviet Russia and its satellites substantiate the



dependence of the United Nations upon U.S. contributions:

(1) *Expenditures of U.N. Special Fund through 1962*

(Thousands)	
1959.....	\$37,368
1960.....	59,715
1961.....	36,159
1962.....	81,454
Total.....	214,726

(2) *U.S. contribution to Special Fund through 1962*

(Thousands)	
1959.....	\$10,325
1960.....	15,842
1961.....	19,525
1962.....	25,341
Total.....	71,033

(3) *Percent of U.S. contribution to fund in relation to expenditures through 1962*

1959.....	27.63
1960.....	26.53
1961.....	53.95
1962.....	31.11

(4) *Soviet Union and satellite pledges through 1962*

A. PLEDGES (IN U.S. DOLLARS)

	1959	1960	1961	1962
Albania.....			2,000	2,000
Bulgaria.....		14,706	14,706	17,647
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Cuba.....				25,000
Czechoslovakia.....	69,444	69,444	69,444	69,444
Hungary.....	42,608	42,608	42,608	42,608
Poland.....	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Rumania.....	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667
Soviet Union.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.....	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Yugoslavia.....	150,000	175,000	192,000	220,000

B. PERCENT OF PLEDGE IN RELATION TO EXPENDITURES

	1959	1960	1961	1962
Albania.....			0.006	0.002
Bulgaria.....		0.02	.04	.02
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.....	0.13	.08	.14	.06
Cuba.....				.03
Czechoslovakia.....	.18	.12	.19	.09
Hungary.....	.11	.07	.12	.05
Poland.....	.33	.21	.35	.15
Rumania.....	.04	.03	.05	.02
Soviet Union.....	2.68	1.67	2.76	1.23
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.....	.33	.21	.35	.15
Yugoslavia.....	.40	.29	.53	.27

NOTE.—Cuba and Yugoslavia have been included as members of the Soviet bloc.

**WE NEED TO CONSERVE THE WILD ANIMALS OF THE WORLD BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE**

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference to

begin a worldwide cooperative effort to conserve wild animals.

Such an effort is most urgently needed. A world conference can provide the basis for decisive measures to save many of the world's most famous animals which are now threatened with extinction.

MANY ANIMALS ARE THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION

In these days the words "critical" and "desperate" are used so often and so casually that we become inured to them and often fail to accept their full meaning. But I assure the Members that these words should be given their full weight when they are used to describe the plight of many species of wild animals in the world today. Man has already ignobly succeeded in exterminating about 200 species of birds and animals, among them beautiful, useful and once plentiful creatures. The common phrase, "dead as a dodo," serves as a continual reminder of one species wiped out by man. Now we recklessly threaten nearly 250 species with the same fate. These almost condemned creatures include some of the most spectacular and successful animals evolved during millions of years. Yet if we continue our present course, they may be gone forever in a decade or less. And none of the scientific and technological prowess of which we are justly proud will suffice to recreate any of them.

The American bald eagle, the emblem of our Nation, may exist only metalically on our coins one day. Its numbers are dangerously reduced.

A partial rollcall of immediately threatened species includes the California condor, the polar bear, the woodland caribou, the trumpeter swan, and the sandhill and whooping cranes in the United States, the giant tortoise, the Arabian oryx, the Ceylon elephant, the Kashmir stag, all species of wild chinchilla, the Angolan giraffe, and several types of rhinoceros. An experienced game warden in East Africa has warned that unless something is done promptly, the great migratory herds of antelopes, rhinos and elephants, among others, will be doomed in a decade or less. This is a terrible prospect which demands our attention.

THE SLAUGHTER IS FREQUENTLY SENSELESS

The reasons for the prospective extermination of many of these animals are so trivial and ridiculous that they reveal the depths of man's thoughtlessness and capacity for injustice. The Arabian oryx, a member of the antelope family, is being gunned down from cars because some Arabs believe that by killing an oryx they will obtain the animal's legendary courage and virility. The rhinoceros is being hunted and killed so that the horn can be cut off and ground into powder for sale in parts of Asia where the myth persists that it is an aphrodisiac. The desire for the tails of wildebeests and giraffes so that they might be sold for several dollars as fly swatters has led to the destruction of countless of these animals. Fashion fads that have required animals' skins or feathers have decimated wildlife populations. Much of the destruction of wildlife is deliberate and so highly organized that even fabu-

lous abundance will not by itself prevent a species from soon being snuffed out.

Ironically, but perhaps logically, the threat to wildlife is most acute in Africa, the continent we traditionally associate in our minds with the most marvelous variety and wealth of animal life. A century ago, reports from Africa told of huge herds of antelope and zebra and an amazing profusion of elephants, hippos, and rhino. Although nowadays the picture is still of large herds, surveys indicate that all these animals are greatly reduced in numbers. In parts of the continent where they once lived, some of these animals are nonexistent outside zoos, preserves, and farms.

The reasons for this downtrend are easy to find. Newspaper reports and other accounts describe an annual slaughter that the less prolific species cannot stand much longer.

MUCH OF THE DESTRUCTION IS DELIBERATE KILLING

Much of the killing is to provide ivory, horn, skins, pelts, and other animal products for export. A quite large number of animals can be killed legally to meet the demand for animal products. In Kenya, for example, between 1955 and 1960 the yearly legal sales were 1,400 pounds of horn and 73,000 pounds of ivory. Thus the desire for a supposed sexual stimulant, for chessmen and billiard balls and other products that could be met within legal bounds required the death of 175 to 200 rhino and 1,000 elephants annually.

But this legal killing amounts to only a fraction of the total destruction of African wild animals. Poachers take a truly terrible toll every year in a business which is, as the eminent biologist, Sir Julian Huxley, reported after an African survey, "profitable, highly organized, extremely cruel, and quite ruthless." This widespread illegal killing is also very wasteful in the short run. In the long run, it will be disastrous ecologically and economically.

Most of the demand for the products of African wild animals originates in the United States and in Western Europe. It reflects trends, fads, and vagaries in fashion. After several prominent ladies of fashion appeared in leopard skin coats recently, a demand for leopard skins far in excess of the supply from legal sources suddenly materialized. Immediately, a motley crew of white entrepreneurs descended upon the African bush in search of fast profits. The leopard, which is not scarce but is reduced below the balance of nature in several areas, was reduced still further. British Overseas Airways installed a weekly flight from Uganda to London to transport leopard skins.

POACHING IS RAMPANT

The white entrepreneurs find that there are few law enforcement officers to hinder illegal killing of the desired animals. Typically, this type of white hunter hunts nothing more than an African or Asian middle man who in turn easily finds natives willing to poach for a paltry share of the profits. The African poacher runs no great risk anyway for he is hard to catch and when caught faces very little real punishment. The

authorities tend toward the view that he is doing what comes naturally. If they try to impose punishment at all, fines are virtually impossible since few natives have any money. A jail sentence is usually prized as a sort of paid vacation in which the government provides the food and lodging which are constantly struggled for in the bush.

So the native goes gladly about his poaching, with hair-raising cruelty. Wire loop snares are spread widely around the landscape, particularly at gaps in thorny barriers set up by the poachers. Wire of sufficient strength to hold even an elephant is cheap and readily available. One end is attached to a tree or log. Zebras, wildebeests, antelopes, rhinos, and elephants are caught by the leg in these devices and suffer intense pain as their struggling causes the wire to cut deeply into their flesh. They die slowly in agony. The poachers visit the snares only infrequently, so as not to be troubled by arriving while the animals still live.

Arrows smeared with a poison that acts so slowly that the animal is subjected to long suffering are also much in favor among the poachers. Another weapon frequently used is the muzzle-loading gun, of which there are reportedly more than 100,000 in the hands of natives of Kenya and Northern Rhodesia alone. These firearms, loaded with whatever miscellaneous hardware lies at hand, are fired into herds, maiming and wounding many animals. In some cases the wounded creatures may be more easily tracked and killed but often they die unnoticed in the bush.

Another poachers' device is the pitfall covered with branches and studded with pointed stakes. A lingering death awaits the animals falling into these pits, for they are seldom killed outright.

#### THE KILLING IS EXTREMELY WASTEFUL

Sometimes the animals are used for meat which is shipped to nearby African towns by "bicycle boys." More often, only the horns, tusks, skins or other wanted parts are removed and the remains left to rot. Frequently, the animal blindly killed is not the one whose parts are currently in vogue and it is merely left where it fell. The illegal exports start their journey to America or Europe by devious paths to the coast where a tramp steamer waits, by long overland routes to nations from which they may be exported without hindrance and by air.

High profits for the poaching master are the rule in this grisly trade. For example, the native poacher in East Africa will probably get about 7 to 10 shillings—98 cents to \$1.40—per pound for rhino horn which sells on the open market for 90 shillings—\$12.60. Much of the difference is pocketed by the white entrepreneur, some of whom have boasted of earnings of \$50,000 a year in their callously destructive undertaking.

#### KILLING FOR SPORT AND FOOD

Wildlife is also being killed deliberately and haphazardly for sport, food, and in attempts to wipe out animal-borne diseases and to protect crops and domestic animals. Although there is some poaching, most of the killing for these purposes is legal, a fact that often

is an illustration of the weakness of the game laws.

There are still some "slaughter safaris," but most countries have bag limits that are respected by hunters. Sportsmen are also frequently interested in conservation. And there are an increasing number of safaris that do their shooting with cameras only.

Usually the killing for food is ruinously wasteful. The lechwe antelope, which is killed for meat, has been subjected to mass hunts by men and dogs in which thousands were spared to death at once, including young and pregnant females. As a result, of course, its numbers were reduced sharply and rapidly so that there are less than one-eighth as many as there were 30 years ago.

#### MANY ANIMALS ARE BEING KILLED BY FIRE

Innumerable wild animals have been killed in Africa in campaigns against the sleeping sickness, but with little success in eliminating the scourge. Since the hides and meat from these animals are not used, this program entails the loss of very large potential incomes.

In Africa, another significant cause of destruction of animals and their habitats is fire. Aside from many blazes stemming from natural causes and human carelessness, others are set purposely for spectacles or as a means of driving game to a place where it may be killed. Wardens suspect that a number of fires in national parks have been planned to force animals out of the protective surroundings into death-dealing traps.

#### WILDLIFE HABITATS ARE BEING DESTROYED

In addition to the deliberate killing that occurs, as I have described, particularly in Africa but also elsewhere in the world, there is the usually inadvertent destruction of wildlife through man's changes in the environment.

These changes occur very obviously in the construction of roads and the establishment of towns and industries. The impounding of large bodies of water by dams and hydroelectric projects on one hand and the drainage of wetlands and marshes on the other will harm the wildlife of those areas.

Another major source of damage to wildlife is water pollution, not only of inland water but of the seas. Discharges of urban sewage, of toxic wastes from factories and of petroleum on the high seas take their toll of birds and water animals.

Attempts to divert marginal land to uses to which it is not well suited also injures wildlife with little or no compensating benefit. Marginal bushland converted for grazing of cattle in Africa has produced far less needed protein than could have been obtained by well-managed game ranching. Before being used for grazing the land provided a great variety of plants. To match this, there was a differentiation of herbivores to make use of all the vegetable resources. But when put into use for cattle grazing, the land was stripped and it deteriorated rapidly.

#### MISAPPLIED SCIENCE AID EXOTIC ANIMALS HARM HABITATS

The application of scientific knowledge to the benefit of one animal can

bring an unprecedented increase in its numbers with consequent harm to the habitat and other animals. Improved veterinary practices have allowed a large expansion in the herds of scrubby cattle that the Masai tribe of East Africa use as money and measures of prestige. The result is large areas that are in bad shape from overgrazing and unable to support the wildlife that had lived there.

The harm to native animals and their environment that can result from the introduction of a highly successful exotic animal is notorious, with the depredations of the outlandish rabbit in Australia being perhaps the most familiar example. Unfortunately, animals are being moved about in the world today with little thought about the damaging results to native animals.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to assign blame for these tragedies but only to describe the problem as it exists. We cannot feel complacent in this country, for there is much we have failed to do to perfect our own conservation program, though our resources are sufficient to the task. It may be recalled, too, that the flightless, penguin-like Great Auk once populated our Atlantic coast in large numbers. After several centuries of indiscriminate clubbing, the last one was killed in 1844. We still appear bent on destroying other species by failure to practice conservation. But we have also shown in our rescues of the bison and the pronghorn antelope that it is possible to reverse an animal's downslide to obliteration and give it a new lease on life.

#### PRIVATE GROUPS ARE WORKING TO CONSERVE WORLD WILDLIFE

The picture I have presented is dark indeed. It would be blacker still if it were not for the efforts of several organizations which are already attempting to promote conservation of wild animals throughout the world.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—is the foremost among these. It was formed in 1948 under the sponsorship of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO. The IUCN, with headquarters in Morges, Switzerland, is now an independent organization but it still works closely with UNESCO and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. It has as members the governments of Belgium, Cambodia, Dahomey, Denmark, West Germany, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaya, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela, and South Vietnam and more than 240 organizations throughout the world.

The IUCN has held several general assemblies of its members—the latest in June 1960 at Warsaw. An eighth general assembly is scheduled to be held from September 12 to 20, 1963, in Nairobi, Kenya. It will focus particularly on problems in Africa.

The IUCN has established a professional staff to collect and distribute information on preservation of wildlife. Its Survival Service Commission strives to catalog and preserve threatened



species. Its studies have been the basis for action to save wild animals native to the Middle East and Southern Asia and have led to the foundation of a group to preserve the remarkable animals of the Galapagos Islands. With aid from UNESCO, the IUCN has made country-by-country reviews of the status of nature protection in many parts of the world.

#### AFRICA HAS BEEN SINGLED OUT FOR SPECIAL ATTENTION

As a result of a decision at Warsaw that the most critical threat to wildlife was in Africa, the IUCN has undertaken a three-stage African special project to attempt to deal with the problem. This project, which is being carried out in cooperation with other international and national organizations, is aimed at convincing African leaders and public opinion of the need and value of nature conservation. In addition, assistance is being given through the exchange of scientific and technical information. The threatened animals are initially the subject of particular attention.

A conference at Arusha, Tanganyika, in September 1961, brought together leading figures in the new African states and African, European, and American scientists and administrators. FAO, which was represented at the conference, announced its concern with the status of African wildlife and its intention to support conservation measures. Two wildlife experts, who are being paid by the FAO, have been hired to provide professional services and advice on wildlife problems.

As another part of the African special project, Sir Julian Huxley investigated the status of African wildlife for UNESCO in 1960 and wrote a report that has provided some of the valuable information I have presented to the House today. Dr. F. F. Darling, vice president and director of research for the Conservation Foundation also made an exploratory survey of 14 African countries.

But the IUCN and other existing agencies are not capable of meeting the problem without greater aid. The IUCN has only a small budget, reportedly amounting to about \$90,000. No large, wealthy nation except West Germany belongs. To contrast resources with the need, the World Wildlife Fund—International—estimates that \$1.5 million a year is needed to save the most seriously threatened animals and that a realistic worldwide wildlife conservation program would cost at least \$3 million.

The WWF—International—is a sponsoring organization of national groups which exist in the United States, England, and the Netherlands and are being established in Germany, France, and Switzerland. Among the projects to which the WWF has contributed were: the establishment of the Charles Darwin Research Foundation to preserve the giant tortoise, the penguin, the flightless cormorant, the flamingo, and the fur seal; an expedition to take into captivity a breeding stock of the Arabian oryx; purchase of part of the famous Marismas at the mouth of the Guadalquivir in Spain to save the most important marsh-

land wilderness in Europe and the return of 28 Hawaiian geese, bred by the Wildfowl Trust in England, to a national park on Maui Island from which they disappeared some years ago.

The WWF has been aided by Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, but its efforts still fall short of meeting the need.

There are other groups making contributions to the work to promote conservation, among them the Conservation Foundation mentioned previously; the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, which raises funds to train Africans in conservation; the United States Agency for International Development which is aiding in the establishment of a school of wildlife management in Tanganyika; the Interior Department, which is working on a program for wildlife management in Africa; and the new Canadian Wildlife Foundation, which should extend measures to conserve wildlife in North America.

In addition, the Fulbright program has provided a number of scientists to work abroad in the fields of conservation and wildlife management.

#### THE HUMAN INTEREST IN SAVING OUR WILDLIFE

Why, it may be asked, should we worry about saving all these wild animals?

Part of the answer, surely, is that there are inherent, sentimental and esthetic values in doing so. The different world we will have when the last lions or rhinos are to be found in zoos or when a youngster must ask "What was a lion, daddy?" is evident. The inherent value of preserving animals that have caught and held man's attention from time immemorial hardly requires advocacy. There is a spectator value in the threatened wildlife that is altogether incomparable and irreplaceable. Many of these beasts are as beautiful as anything ever upon this earth and contemplation of that beauty cannot help but affect and uplift human sentiments.

"To see large animals going about their natural business in their own natural way, assured and unafraid, is one of the most exciting and moving experiences in the world, comparable with the sight of a noble building or the hearing of a great symphony or mass," Sir Julian Huxley once wrote.

This by itself argues strongly in favor of vigorous conservation measures. But in addition, there are very practical reasons for conserving the wildlife of the world.

Wildlife is a valuable subject of study to establish important scientific principles. Some of the areas of Africa contain climax communities which represent the highest development of the prehuman ecological system.

#### THE ECONOMIC VALUE IN SAVING OUR WILDLIFE

More practical still is the economic potential of wildlife under proper conservation. Wildlife can and should be a significant factor in the economic growth of the developing nations. By properly managed game ranching, wildlife can provide more much-needed meat than is being obtained from the reckless, indiscriminate slaughter now being practiced. And because of the differentia-

tions of type among wildlife to perfectly fit the environment, game ranching can in many cases provide more meat than could be obtained from turning the land over to the grazing of domestic stock or to agriculture. The crop of domestic livestock, mostly cattle, in East Africa grassland is slightly more than 30,000 pounds per square mile. On savannah it sinks to under 16,000 pounds. But for wild game on savannah the figure is between 66,000 and 90,000 pounds. On African land which will support one cow on 30 acres, game can yield 4 pounds of meat per acre for every 3 pounds from cattle, experts estimate. This yield from game could be increased if modest sums were invested to improve the habitat, by opening new water holes, for example. Moreover, game ranching protects the environment whereas the grazing of cattle on much of the land now occupied by wildlife leads to its rapid deterioration. The advantages of depending upon game ranching is also very great in areas where use of cattle or other domestic animals is barred by the presence of diseases and pests. In South Africa, game ranching is already an important supplement to income derived from domestic animals on many farms.

Not only does game ranching produce meat, but also the hides and other animal parts which are so much in demand in the Western World and elsewhere. By management to assure that the animal sources of these products are not soon killed off and by subjecting the trade to controls, the developing nations can assure themselves and the world a continuing and perhaps increasing source of revenue.

#### WILDLIFE WILL BRING TOURIST INCOME TO DEVELOPING NATIONS

Tourism generated by the presence of extraordinary wildlife can also be a source of revenue for nations that preserve their animals. Already expenditures by tourists comprise the second largest source of revenue in Kenya, amounting to some \$22 million. Through the construction of better roads and accommodations and by developing national parks replete with films, guides, lectures, information bureaus in the manner of many of our parks and natural attractions income from tourism can be increased further. The Treetops facility in Kenya where visitors can spend a night in a tree shelter with the certainty of seeing a variety of wild animals going their way unaware of human presence has become very popular. Continued urbanization and industrialization of the United States and Europe will enhance the attraction of such settings in Africa and other developing nations if wildlife is conserved. But the developing nations lack the means to avail themselves of this opportunity without aid for that purpose.

#### A WORLD CONFERENCE CAN MARSHAL THE COMPREHENSIVE MEASURES NEEDED TO SAVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE

Many of the threatened animals are native to areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. It may, therefore, be asked why we in the United States and in this Congress need to concern ourselves with their fate.

I would reply that each species, wherever it may live, belongs to all mankind. When the stock of life is diminished by the senseless slaughter now going on, all of us lose something very real and irreplaceable. We have an interest in preventing the squandering of the animal riches of the world and in avoiding the day when man and his domestic animals alone occupy the globe.

The United States is also seeking to promote the development of many of the nations which possess the greatest wild animal resources. By helping them to see the value of conserving these resources and by aiding them to begin their conservation programs we can, at small cost, make a considerable contribution to their growth, their ability to fulfill the rising expectations of their people and their capacities to remain independent parts of the free world.

The participation of the governments of the world is needed since they control conservation programs within their borders, regulate imports and exports, and can provide the funds that are required to reap the benefits of conservation. Action to control imports of wild animal products can be of great assistance to nations attempting to prevent the outrages of poachers. With vast areas and few wardens this presents tremendous enforcement problems otherwise. Import bans or limitations would strike at the poachers' incentive to crime and put new difficulties in their way. For import restrictions to be effective, they must be imposed by all importing countries. It would be of little value to prevent the fashionable ladies of America from having leopard-skin coats, for example, while their counterparts in England or Germany continued to buy them apace.

Since bilateral negotiations would necessarily be protracted and cumbersome, an international conference seems the best way of focusing attention on the problem and getting the world started toward more general, more effective action by governments and private groups to save the world's wildlife. The nations represented at the conference could hammer out an agreement on a total program, set out the responsibilities of each nation, make provision for new studies in areas where information is lacking and decide, at least tentatively, how the program will be financed. It is possible that the wildlife conference might be held in conjunction with the World Food Congress of the Freedom From Hunger Campaign of the FAO in Washington June 4 to 18, 1963.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 107 follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference within one year after the adoption of this concurrent resolution for the purpose of initiating cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis.

Sec. 2. The following countries should be invited to participate in the conference:

(1) Those countries (hereinafter referred to as the "consuming countries") whose demand for furs, skins, pelts, tusks, feathers, and other parts of wild animals, or whose citizens, by hunting wild game, cause a

diminution of species of wild animals, and which include, but are not limited to, the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

(2) Those countries (hereinafter referred to as the "producing countries") in which the major wild animal habitats exist and which include, but are not limited to, countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Sec. 3. The conference should consider the following cooperative actions:

(1) Legislative or administrative action by consuming countries curtailing or banning imports of commodities the chief value of which is derived from wild animals; and

(2) Assistance by consuming countries to producing countries, either unilaterally or multilaterally through the United Nations or other international agencies, to establish training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists, to establish conservation departments in the producing countries, or otherwise to assist desired world conservation programs; and

(3) Joint study by producing and consuming countries to determine how wildlife conservation and management can increase tourist revenues for producing countries; and

(4) Assistance by the United States to the producing countries through use of local currency accruing to the United States under the food-for-peace program to further the objectives stated in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section; and

(5) Any other action to promote wild animal conservation.

DEVELOPED NATIONS CAN AID IN ELIMINATING POACHING AND IN TRAINING CONSERVATIONISTS

Some of the specific steps proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 107 could go far toward meeting major specific parts of the problem. Many leaders in the developing nations see the need to conserve their wildlife resources but lack the means to act decisively. Subsection 1 of section 3 proposes a way of aiding developing nations in eliminating the devastating poaching now going on, by controlling imports of the skins and other products of threatened animals.

Another great deficiency in meeting the threat to wildlife is the great shortage of specialists in wildlife management and conservation in the developing nations. There are so many demands on the limited supply of highly trained persons and so strong an impulse among the educated to forsake the bush for the city, that aid particularly to train game managers, conservationists and ecologist is very much needed. A college to train game wardens is to be established in Tanganyika but it is only a small beginning. The need is large. There are fewer than 30 wardens for 355,000 square miles in Tanganyika. In Kenya, for instance, there are only 22 for 200,000 square miles. The central agencies concerned with conservation are embryonic. House Concurrent Resolution 107 proposes that the conference consider means by which the developed countries that import wild animal products can aid the developing nations to establish training schools and conservation departments.

Relatively small outlays to bring Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans to this country for training in wildlife management and to supplement efforts to set up conservation colleges in the developing countries could pay big dividends. The resolution suggests a means by

which some of this could be financed, through use of local currency accruing to the United States under the food-for-peace program.

It is clear, as I pointed out earlier, that the nations fortunate enough to have marvelous stocks of wild animals can derive considerable tourism income from them. But to make the most of this possibility they will have to make some improvements in roads, tourist accommodations, information services and other preparations. To avoid ill-conceived projects and waste, careful studies of the economics of each proposal will be requisite. Joint study by the developed nations, whose citizen will comprise the bulk of the tourists, and the developing nations offers the best approach to the situation. This is proposed in subsection 3 of section 3 of House Concurrent Resolution 107.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will take note of the desperate plight of the many magnificent animals of which I have spoken and of the demands of reason and morality that the current rush toward extermination be stopped. I hope it will promptly pass House Concurrent Resolution 107.

#### DIALOG ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I assure you I do not intend to take for myself all the time allotted to me but shall make my remarks as brief as possible. Before I begin my prepared remarks, entitled "Dialog on the Economy of the United States," as requested by President Kennedy last June in his speech at Yale, bearing on the question of tax reduction and tax reforms, I should like to make two things clear:

First, I shall finish my statement and then I shall be glad to yield to anyone on the floor.

Second, my remarks, while they may include political implications in that I shall refer to certain political statements made in the past and apply them to the present, it is not my intention to make a partisan speech.

I want especially to call to the attention of the Members of the House that only yesterday again I read in the newspaper some remarks made by our Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, a man for whom I have the highest respect and admiration not only as a statesman but as a politician. I do so because it seems that when we Republicans stand up and fight for our beliefs and our principles and point up what we believe to be the errors, mistakes and bungling, if you will, of the Executive of this country, we are immediately accused of political motives by



members of the Democrat Party as did the Democrats when I spoke a couple of weeks ago on the economy of the country. But the Democrats very rarely go back to their own remarks of just a couple of years ago when President Eisenhower was the Executive of this Nation, when they sniped at him continuously for 8 long years, even to the point at which many of the remarks, such as those on the missile gap, were very dangerous. Recall also, Democrat criticism of the matter of U.S. prestige in the world, again a very dangerous political attack. This continued from one end of the land to the other, day in and day out, and we had to accept it as being the political rights of the Democrat Party.

Mr. Speaker, I shall read this statement as rapidly as I can.

Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself for a few minutes to the problems of our sagging economy and the changing moods and methods of this administration with reference thereto.

Then, I invite my colleagues to join in the discussion because this is a matter of extreme importance to our country. What I say will not be of a partisan nature and cannot be so construed.

Let us start with the period in which Mr. Kennedy, then a U.S. Senator, was a candidate for the Presidency.

In reply to a question by the Scripps-Howard newspapers October 3, 1960, Mr. Kennedy said:

It is extremely important that the United States maintain, to the extent that it is possible, a balanced budget. The only true reasons justifying an unbalanced budget would be a great national emergency—and serious unemployment.

Now, it should be noted here that, first, we now face no great national emergency; and, second, any unemployment is too much, but the unbalanced budgets of the last few years have not decreased it. Actually, unemployment has gone up a little while the unbalance of our budgets on the red ink side has gone up and up, during the first 2 years of this administration and in the budget before us now.

The facts are: To my knowledge, President Kennedy has not sent to this Congress a single idea designed to balance the budget, but that, on the contrary, he continues to send us programs that will cost increasingly fantastic amounts of money, and planned deficits.

Then, the President made his famous Yale University commencement address in June 1962, in which he called for a dialog on the problems by this time besetting the American economy.

Two months later, in August, he told a nationwide television audience why he would not propose a tax cut at that time.

But now we have the administration's tax-cut, tax-reform program before us in the Congress. President Kennedy sent it up here with the flat warning that he must have an all-or-nothing package of tax cuts and tax reforms.

The President's fiscal spokesman, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, in answer to a question by Mr. Brynes of Wisconsin, that unless

the tax-cut, tax-reform proposal was adopted in a package, he would recommend a Presidential veto.

Subsequently, the President began to hear from Members of the House and from the people. He found they didn't agree with these screwball economics such as a tax cut, by borrowing \$12 billion; followed by tax reforms to take it back, and adding to the national debt, and increased inflation.

So, on February 25 last, the President told the American Bankers Association he would be satisfied with a tax cut alone. He already had estimated officially that the entire package as originally requested would result in a deficit of nearly \$12 billion. Without the so-called tax reforms where would the deficit go?

Where, in fact, has the idea of a balanced budget gone in the mind of the President if, in reality, he ever did have such an idea?

Now, let us go back to another speech Mr. Kennedy made at Rockford, Ill., on October 24, 1960. He said:

Members of the House of Representatives have great responsibility placed upon them by the Constitution. They are the representatives of the people. Therefore, the power to tax, to appropriate money, other great powers, are vested in Members of the House.

If the President believes in this constitutional power, why then has he so aggressively interfered with the affairs of Congress?

I refer to his personal intercession in stacking the Rules Committee of the House in the 87th and 88th Congresses in order to get what he called a committee that would be responsive to his legislative requests.

Why has he interfered at the start of this session to load the Finance Committee of the other body with people responsive to his wishes?

I ask the President to study his statements in the light of subsequent attempts by him to pressure the Members of the House into adopting his tax package under threat of a recession.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President's statement at Rockford, Ill. We, as Members of the House, are the representatives of the people. We do have great responsibility. We do have the power to tax and appropriate money.

In my opinion, it is high time we made the truth of the statement very clear. We do represent the people.

And, in my opinion, the people are sick and tired of high taxes, deficits, and inflation brought about by gimmick programs to which the President is so persistently devoted.

In my opinion, the people I represent are sick and tired of their Government continuing to bleed them, to finance all kinds of fantastic schemes, continuing, meantime, to operate at a deficit with an ever-increasing national debt leading to higher inflation and inevitably to bankruptcy.

The dialog Mr. Kennedy asked for is on in a big way.

Many divergent views are expressed in various ways. But, the basic theme of it all, is, that what we need to get the

country going, as President Kennedy has phrased it, is to cut the expenses of government before we cut its revenue.

Every housewife, every worker, every businessman knows that to keep his financial head above water, he must do that very thing, so he asks very logically: "Why should not my Government do that, too?"

Now, the President finds himself and his administration in an embarrassing position for which he would like to shift the blame to Congress—to Members of the House especially.

Nobody objects to paying his fair share of taxes. But, the people wonder, Mr. Speaker, why their Government should continue to go further in debt—a debt on which the interest alone, some \$10½ billion, takes second highest position in the budget.

"When, if ever," they ask, "can we begin to get rid of this debt and interest payment if we cannot begin now when our Nation enjoys its highest national product, greatest national income and most people employed?"

That's a good question. And, the only answer to it is that we can never begin to attack the debt until the responsible leaders of the administration learn basic economics.

The very proposal of the President's tax-cut, tax-reform program violates basic economics. Surely, the administration knows it. And, yet, the leaders of the President's party have been told from the White House that this program must pass or Mr. Kennedy's chances for reelection will not be so bright.

In any event, the President's pronouncement that he must have a tax cut and tax reform bill or the country would be plunged into a recession was the appeal of a frantic man.

He recognized insurmountable opposition to his program, not only in the Congress, but among the people—opposition coming from just about every segment of the population, as is pointed out in U.S. News & World Report which lists these groups as a few: churches, charity groups, homeowners, homebuilders, elderly people, stockholders—17 million—employee groups.

Other new tax ideas to which there is objection include: tighter rules on stock options, capital gains taxes on estates and gifts, limits on casualty-loss deductions, speedup in payment of taxes by large companies.

The President's frantic state of mind overcame his judgment to the point at which he actually shook the economic foundations with his forecast of a recession. For him to so predict is to undermine the confidence of investors et al on whose confidence rests the economic future.

If this was an attempt to blackmail the Congress into passing his tax reduction bill by shifting the blame for any recession that might occur to Capitol Hill, the President is resorting to ruthless interference with the congressional responsibility he so aptly recognized in his Rockford, Ill., speech in October 1960.

The opposition I have recounted came when the people began to understand

some of the provisions of the administration plan, which are as follows:

#### ADMINISTRATION TAX PROPOSALS

##### I. Reductions

(a) Personal: Income tax would be reduced from present 20-percent to 91-percent range to a 14-percent to 65-percent range over a 3-year period.

(b) Corporate: Normal tax would be reduced from 30 percent to 22 percent on \$25,000 or less. Surtax on income of more than \$25,000 goes up in 1963 from present 22 percent to 30 percent; would be reduced in 1964 to 28 percent and 1965 to 25 percent. Net effect: Good tax break for small companies immediately; a 5-percent reduction for larger firms after 3 years.

##### II. Reforms (the major proposals concerning which there is the most controversy)

###### (a) Deductions (personal):

1. Itemized deductions: Only itemized deductions (taxes, interest, contributions, medical expenses) in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income deductible. Present law: All such items deductible.

2. Casualty losses: Only casualty losses (fire, flood, theft, etc.) in excess of 4 percent of adjusted gross income deductible.

3. Dividend credit: Eliminated.

4. Dividend exemption: \$50 dividend exemption eliminated.

5. Sick pay credit: Eliminated.

###### (b) Other changes:

1. Estate gift: Capital gains tax on appreciation of property at time of decedent's death or at time of gift.

2. Stock options: Increased value of stock between time option is made and exercised would be taxed as regular income. For ex-

ample: If one is given an option to buy stock valued at \$100 and 6 months later exercises that option, and the market price of the stock has climbed to \$150, the added \$50 would be taxed at regular income.

3. Disability pensions: Now not taxed; would be.

4. Government pensions: State, local, or Federal now not taxed; would be.

5. Acceleration: Corporations with tax liability of \$100,000 or more required to speed up payments so that by 1965 they would be on current basis.

6. Group insurance: Employer contributions to group insurance programs to be considered as employee income and would be taxable as such.

The President expressed surprise at the opposition. I wondered, as do many others, where the President got such ideas.

The Chairman of Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Walter Heller, came before the Joint Committee on Economic Affairs to defend the plan. He gave at least a part of the answer to where such ideas come from. Mr. Heller said it was remarkable that the "basic puritan ethic of the American people" would overcome their desire for a tax cut.

Well, let us compare what one great American, Benjamin Franklin, said about this subject, with what Mr. Heller said, as published in the U.S. News & World Report, a compilation of their comparative views:

#### BEN FRANKLIN ON DEBT

Sayings of Benjamin Franklin, as published in "Poor Richard's Almanack" about 1750, had a lot to do with forming Americans' early ideas on borrowing money and having debts. Some of Franklin's teachings:

"He that goes a borrowing goes a sorrowing."

"If you'd be wealthy, think of saving, more than of getting. The Indies have not made Spain rich, because her Outgoes equal her Incomes."

"Beware of little Expenses: a small Leak will sink a great Ship."

"Tis against some Men's Principle to pay Interest, and seems against others' Interest to pay the Principal."

"Rather go to bed supperless than run in debt for a breakfast."

"The second Vice is Lying; the first is running in Debt."

"Spare and have is better than spend and crave."

"Pay what you owe, and you'll know what is your own."

"He that buys by the penny, maintains not only himself, but other people."

"Frugality: Make no expense but to do good to others or yourself; that is, waste nothing."

"It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright."

In reading these opposition views, one must wonder which one has been proved by history to be right. Ben Franklin or

#### AND THE NEW WAY OF LOOKING AT DEBT

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

"I think it is quite remarkable that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reductions because of (a) their fears of deficits, and the additions to the national debt; and (b) because they do not understand that their spending, in effect, makes this contribution to the national growth and full employment."

"This economy is running well short of its potential. The tax cuts can generate higher output, higher employment, higher incomes; can, in effect, broaden the base for taxes so that any increase in the deficit is really a downpayment on a stronger economy and on future surpluses when this economy comes back to something approximating full employment."

"It isn't a choice between no tax cut and a balanced budget on the one hand, and a tax cut and a deficit on the other. It is a choice between a deficit of weakness which comes from sliding along below full employment, and a deficit of strength, or a deficit of transition, which comes from cutting taxes, leaving more money in the hands of private individuals, and invigorating the economy. And I think that business itself, as you can see, has come more and more to this point of view."

Walter Heller? This is an easy one to answer. Certainly the puritan ethic expressed by Franklin has been the rock

of our Nation and its economy. The Heller concept is simply the Keynesian theory of economics that proved near fatal in England, and during our depression years.

I would suggest to President Kennedy that he fire his battery of pseudoeconomists and allow them to return to the ivory towers at Harvard, and so forth. Among these I include America's leading advocate of democratic socialism, Arthur Schlesinger, and Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, whose advice the West German Government rejected in 1951, and, by so doing, went on to create the healthiest economy in Europe.

You know, we do not have to spend a dime of the taxpayers' money to build rockets to send these advisers into orbit. I am convinced they are up there already. I hope the President personally is not as confused about this situation as his ever-changing mood and direction would indicate.

But, whatever the reason may be, there can be no doubt that he has lost his way; that he needs an experienced guide. The Members of this House can be that guide.

The President should simply reduce nonessential spending and then present to the Congress a comprehensive tax reform bill along the lines of H.R. 266, the Herlong-Baker bill. This bill provides for tax reduction on a graduated scale over a 5-year period and covers both corporate and personal income taxes. This would release the additional money needed for more rapid plant expansion, retooling, and increased research. It would further put additional money in the consumer's hands for increasing the purchasing power of the American public. The stimulus from this increased economic activity would create more jobs and make up for lost revenues from increased taxable incomes.

Another great contribution the President could make to getting the country going is a publicly expressed change in attitude toward business—a change from the scare tactics he employed in the steel price controversy. His performance then did as much harm to the Nation's economy as anything else in the Nation's history.

During the campaign of 1962, I stated time and time again that I favored tax cuts. They are necessary not only for the well-being of our people directly by permitting them to keep more of their earnings, but for the good of the economy by providing business expansion and jobs for more people.

But, I made the stipulation that I would not vote tax reduction without a like reduction in spending. I said then and repeat now, that my political and economic philosophy will not permit me to absorb the theory of borrowing money to pay for tax reduction. I believe this theory to be screwball economics and economic suicide.

My constituents are under no illusion as to where I stand, believe me. I have informed them regularly since the President's message on tax reduction and tax reforms.



Now, does it seem strange to you, that I, as one Member of this House, have not received a single letter advocating or supporting tax reduction under the President's plan?

On the contrary, I have received considerable mail, from individuals and business, opposing the President's proposal of planned deficits.

I am sure many Members must recall that during the past several years I have referred to deficit financing and backdoor spending as immoral. It has been my position in the past and will remain so.

The policy now advocated by President Kennedy is that of the social planners, the sponsors of the planned economy, the regimenters of the American people, the advocates of purchasing things now to be paid for by our grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Is this not immoral? Is this not the kind of immorality and real danger that is revolting to the American people?

I want to quote an article that appeared in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News entitled: "Aroused Populace Can Halt Administration's Plunge Into Financial Disaster":

From events of the past few months, it has become frighteningly clear—

The article reads—

that President Kennedy \* \* \* no longer believes in the philosophy that progress and prosperity for our Nation can be achieved through the sound principles of a balanced budget. \* \* \* Instead, he has surrendered to the Keynesian philosophy that real prosperity can only be achieved by spending what we do not have for things we do not truly need in the hope this reckless spending binge will produce an artificial kind of prosperity that will keep us afloat in a sea of red ink. \* \* \* It is time more Americans wake up to what is going to happen to their country if we don't get some sanity back in Washington.

Well, I am sure the Fort Lauderdale News is aware by now that the American people have awakened to the real danger, and want none of it.

In the statement by Mr. Heller, he said and I quote:

I think it is quite remarkable that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reduction because of, etc.

This statement by Mr. Heller, in itself, shows a great lack of understanding of the American people. He just does not know and admits it, that the American people are far smarter than he is.

Abraham Lincoln said, many years ago:

You can fool all of the people some of the time; you can fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

The American people are not fooled this time. They are making themselves heard in revolt, and this appears to be surprising to Mr. Heller and his Keynesian followers.

Perhaps it is these economic dreamers who have advised the President to send up the program which he said at Yale would, with the help of Congress, get the country moving.

These included farm controls, aid to depressed areas, medicare, youth employment, manpower retraining, and discretionary Presidential power for public works spending.

It takes a great stretch of the imagination to place any of these in the get-the-country-moving category. For the most part, they have little or nothing to do with the economy, except that they all cost a lot of taxpayers' money.

Whatever else may be said for the President's unsuccessful farm bill, its purpose was to regiment the farmer into producing less, not to stimulate more production.

Regardless of the pros and cons of medicare on other grounds, not even its proponents could very well claim it was a growth additive.

Aid to depressed areas, unemployed youth manpower retraining, public works—all of these are by definition tranquilizers, designed at most to soothe sore spots. They can no more be expected to stimulate growth than did similar programs in the thirties, when all the considerable efforts of Government, year after year, were unable to significantly alleviate mass unemployment, much less lift the economy out of the mire of depression.

Thus it would appear that the help the President sought from Congress—and much of it he got—has not started the country moving.

The answer, in my opinion, lies in a forthright statement by President Kennedy, that he is going to reduce nonessential spending and restore fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government. If he would then reduce his requests for spending, then and only then, should Congress consider tax reduction.

The proper procedure for the Congress to follow, in my opinion, is as follows:

First. Act on all appropriation bills first with a sharp eye toward elimination of nonessential appropriations.

Second. If sufficient cuts are made to more than balance the budget, apply the black ink balance to tax reduction and the national debt.

Speaking for the people of my district now and as I have for many years, I say that we must stop foisting all of these social gimmicks on the people; stop being the tool of the pressure groups.

We must act on behalf of the great majority of the American people who look to us to conduct the affairs of their Government in a sound and sensible way.

Let us put aside the thought of political expediency or who will win the next election.

Let us respond to the puritan ethic of the American people and base our judgment on what is right and what is moral.

Let us assure the American people that principles are the foundation of good and only on this basis will we decide the issues.

For the good of my country, I want to see my President make good. But I will never concede that he is God, or speaks with a God-like voice, no matter how many threats he makes or what terrible retribution he seeks to invoke.

And, finally, let me say this. The task of, and responsibility for, cutting public

expenditures is not limited to the Federal Government.

It is just as important to State and local governments. The people are sick and tired of outlandish government spending, no matter at what level it may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that nobody can conceivably get the idea that I am against lower taxes, I want to make it clear that since I have been in the House I have advocated less spending and less taxes. This is no new position for me.

For instance, it startles me when I realize that our factories, stores, mines, utilities and all other corporations, on an average, must operate the first 190 days of the year—more than half the year—to make enough money to pay their taxes.

As Henry J. Taylor, the learned writer, says:

Surely one definition of socialism is the line beyond which a government gets more than the owners. We've crossed that line, even excluding State, county and community taxes on corporations.

Mr. Taylor further points out that Hitler took only 44 percent of profits; that Mussolini took 40 percent, and that they were, as he says, "pikers compared to Washington's 52 percent bite."

So let there be no question about where I stand. Taxes are too high and they have got to come down.

Taxpayers are already forking over \$2.2 billion more this year in social security taxes. There are 47 State legislatures meeting this year. Preliminary budget estimates indicate they will seek at least \$2.5 billion in additional State taxes.

Many State tax systems are based on the same deductions, allowances, as is that of the Federal Government. President Kennedy reforms which would cut deductions would be incorporated into these State laws, thus raising State taxes. Thirty-three States are studying ways of increasing taxes at present.

As Mark Twain said, maybe we are lucky we are not getting as much government as we are paying for. But paying we certainly are, and a tax cut may be a frustrating, illusory thing.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] on this very excellent and well-prepared speech. I want particularly to ask the gentleman, since he brought Benjamin Franklin into this discussion and since I also read the remarks in U.S. News & World Report which the gentleman quoted—does not the gentleman feel that perhaps if we went back to the original concept of government which prevailed in the days of Benjamin Franklin when the Congress legislated and the executive carried out the legislation, we might be a little better off than we are today since we too are guilty in this respect?

Mr. BECKER. I am in wholehearted agreement with the statement of my

colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from New York. That is exactly what we must do. I think we are hearing more and more about that every day, for we, through the years, have permitted the executive branch of Government and I might say the judicial branch of Government to usurp the power and authority of the Congress. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentlewoman, and that is what I mean here. We must re-assume our responsibilities as one of the three equal branches of the Federal Government.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; I quite agree with him.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine economics discourse. I should like to ask the gentleman if he can point to any one recommendation of the administration that he considers an aid to private industry.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I tried to get at in my remarks; in going over President Kennedy's recommendations, both last year and so far this year, I can find absolutely nothing that would add to the growth of what we call the gross national product upon which income and employment depend and upon which revenues of the Government depend. There is really nothing in here. I would like to see some concrete ideas to get the country moving; that is, legislation in that direction.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the gentleman also can find many instances of harassment of private industry.

Mr. BECKER. I think one of the ways in which President Kennedy could get the country moving, one of the greatest contributions he could make is to get government off the backs of the people and of business and let them operate as business people; do not restrict or confine them so that business does not know whether it is going or coming, and does not know on what day it is going to get hit over the head by threats or through regulation. I think that if we would free our business people, our enterprise system that has made this one of the greatest nations in the world and has put it where it is today, conditions would improve. The Government did not make our country. It provided the rules under which we could live. But it was business, the free people of this Nation, working under laws, that made this the greatest Nation on earth. We could do that again. I think if President Kennedy adopted this idea and moved forward with the idea of reestablishing the moral principles of our government, he would really get this country moving. And I would love to see him do it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman feel that it is impossible to put all of the unemployed to work in the Peace Corps foreign and the Peace Corps domestic, and by increasing the payrolls of the Federal Government?

The Government simply cannot absorb all of the unemployed, as they are attempting to do.

Mr. BECKER. As I said in my statement these are all gimmicks they are using to take the minds of the people off their many problems. I mentioned earlier that the President promised this year to make a greater utilization of the employees of the Federal Government so that we could have less people on the payroll. Then, a couple of days later, he asks us for appropriations to put 37,000 more people on the Federal payroll. These are some of the inconsistencies that I am talking about, that tend to destroy us.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman on a splendid statement. I have a constituency which is very much addicted to letter writing. I, like the gentleman from New York, have yet to receive one letter from a person in my district urging me to support the President's tax program.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate my colleague's saying that because I have had the same expression from many other Members. Mr. Speaker, may I add this: I appreciate the complimentary things that have been said about my statement. I am not a writer of speeches, believe me. All I have done today is to try to get off my mind and off my chest those things which I believe I am for and those which I am against.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York, the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken, for the excellent statement he has made.

He made reference to the Keynesian philosophy of government. It did not come as any surprise to the gentleman when the other day the President said it did not make any difference whether we had any kind of tax reform just so long as he got his tax cut. It seems that at the other end of the avenue his advisers who believe in this Keynesian philosophy that we can spend ourselves into prosperity have been speaking with tongue in cheek when they said that we might have some tax reform but so long as they get money out of the Federal Treasury they can go on spending and spending and electing and electing.

I join with the gentleman in the remarks he has made.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the President recommend another record budget of about \$99 billion, but with lower taxes promised to all. The budget, proposed in a time of prosperity, seeks to meet unemployment problems by massive Federal spending, the same method used unsuccessfully during the New Deal in a time of depression.

It seems to me that such a proposal is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. With a promise of a tax cut and an increased budget there can be only one result, and that is an unbalanced budget and a higher Federal debt.

The President's proposals are based on the premise that joyous taxpayers will join the Government in spending more, creating new economic activity to end unemployment and at the same time produce more tax revenues to wipe out the record deficit.

The value of the dollar meanwhile is supposed to hold steady, contrary to past experience in periods of big Federal deficits.

In looking at the rosy forecasts for increased Federal revenues, some of us keep recalling that Federal spending has climbed much faster than income during the past 2 years. And chief relief for the unemployed has been to put them on the rapidly expanding Federal payroll.

The administration anticipates big cuts in spending for farm programs and international finance with lesser cuts in housing and veterans affairs. There is little reason to look for reduction in any of these areas. In addition, there is evidence that the cost of present and proposed domestic programs has been seriously underestimated.

In all probability, we can look forward to an increase in deficit spending and a higher Federal debt if the administration's budgetary proposals are followed. In the face of an increased deficit, the President has offered a tax cut which will add further to the already soaring Federal debt.

Chief interest is centered in the administration proposal to place a 5-percent floor on tax reductions for such things as interest on home mortgages, contributions to church and charities, and so forth.

The average tax cut for a family of four with an income of \$5,000 is estimated at \$58 by 1965.

Congressional tax experts say the 5-percent floor will reduce the average itemized deductions by between 20 and 30 percent. This includes other changes allowing smaller deductions for medical expenses and casualty losses.

Under present law the standard deduction is equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income—with a ceiling of \$1,000—or a deduction by itemization. The proposed 5-percent floor would appear to reward those who use the standard deduction and penalize those who itemize—which falls most heavily on the middle income group.

At the same time it would seem to discriminate against the homeowner paying local and State taxes and contributing to his church, charity, or school. It would reward the person who does not own his home, does not pay local or State taxes, and does not contribute to charity.

The whole question of tax reduction while increasing Federal spending involves a grandiose gamble. The President is putting everything on the line in the hope that the increased expenditures and tax reduction will result in spectacular economic growth. There is no guarantee that his proposals will work now, when they have failed in the past. If the economy fails to realize such spectacular growth, then tax rates will have to be increased to prereduction levels.

The citizens of South Dakota are deeply concerned about the President's proposals. Many of them have ex-



pressed their views to me. I would like to cite some of the comments which my constituents have expressed in recent letters. They are representative of many additional letters being received:

HON. BEN REIFEL,  
House of Representatives, House Office  
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REIFEL: I am extremely concerned about the Treasury Department's recent recommendation to Congress for changes in our Federal income tax laws.

An inducement to keep good teachers in any community is that fact that under their limited income, and under present legislation, it is possible to purchase a home on a monthly purchase plan. The fact that these folks can presently deduct all of certain expenses in computing the net for tax purposes is surely a positive factor. Home mortgage interest and real estate tax deductions were approved as an inducement for growth of homeownership; this inducement, it seems to me, is as important today as ever before.

Thank you.

Very sincerely yours,

CLAIR T. BLIKRE.

HON. BEN REIFEL,  
U.S. Congressman from South Dakota,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: It appears to me that our congressional representatives should represent their constituents, but there are times when the constituents are misled by governmental propaganda, and at such times, the representation should be a matter of protection of the constituent.

If there was ever a time when the unthinking citizen needed protection, it's now. A tax cut is, of course, popular, but if it entails greater debt, and eventual federalization of our country, I feel that our representatives should save the public from its own ignorance and folly.

Please use your influence and vote to defeat any and all political schemes to perpetuate an all-powerful Central Government.

No one ever successfully spent himself rich. How can Democrats justify their stand? We must return the government to the people.

Respectfully yours,

L. J. PANKOW.

HON. BEN REIFEL,  
Congressman from South Dakota.

DEAR MR. REIFEL: We had a livestock meeting here last night with some of the commission men and packer buyers and one of the topics discussed was income tax crackdown for business people.

There is no question that it is hurting the cattle market. It has probably been abused, but the net result will be less tax money. These farmers are very disturbed about the whole deal, and many seem to think that we will simply raise the U.S. debt.

I personally think that a big tax cut would make more activities for all business and perhaps make more people employed, but how can it help as long as big labor leaders step in and raise more wages. The administration is antagonistic to business anyway.

You must remember when F.D.R. came in 1933 until 1941 with the same kind of gang in power, unemployment was higher in 1941. All farm products were down. We sold hogs for 4 to 5 cents in 1940 and 1941 and the only reason prices came up was the war.

Sincerely,

JIM BIGGAR.

HON. BEN REIFEL,  
U.S. Representative,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. REIFEL: A lot of voters in South Dakota are becoming irate over Fed-

eral spending and what it is costing us. From the information we get, the proposed tax cut is a mere pittance compared to what could be done.

We—I believe I speak for many South Dakotans—are awestruck over the method that is proposed to allow for tax reduction. The beatniks have a phrase for it—"snow job."

In my opinion, it is time that careful legislators band together, tighten controls on spending at home and abroad, making sure we get our dollar's worth; exert pressure on the committee responsible for tax laws that irrigate the bank accounts of most Americans who are literally living from hand to mouth.

The February issue of Nation's Business states that government spending will take 31 percent of the gross national product in 1963 as opposed to 10 percent in 1940 and 24.8 percent in 1955. Perhaps the sages on Capitol Hill know where we are heading and have ceased to listen to the still small voice of the taxpayer and voter who are fearful of a ruptured bubble.

Respectfully yours,

J. E. SWALLUM.

MR. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

MR. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

MR. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

MR. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize that the public is losing confidence in the present administration—

Because of the double failure, for example, that we have had down in Cuba.

Because this administration has allowed the wall to be erected in Berlin.

Because we have had a continuing program of giving aid to the Communist bloc countries.

Because of the fantastic budget proposals that have been made.

Because of the unrealistic tax reduction and reform proposals.

Because of helping form a coalition government with the Communists in Laos.

Because business failures are the highest since 1935.

Because mortgage foreclosures are extremely high.

Because of having alienated the Canadians, the British, the French, the Portuguese, and probably some others.

However, I find it extremely difficult to understand what would motivate the administration to use tactics that may well start a recession in this country. It is quite possible that a recession can be induced when a person in high office starts referring to a recession as being likely if certain legislation is not passed.

The people have gone along with the deficit-spending fiscal irresponsibility of the administration for the past couple of years. Now they are demanding that we return to a sound financial position.

My mail also has been overwhelmingly in favor of not going along with the fiscally irresponsible program of the administration.

MR. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with what he says. I am sure his constituents feel exactly that way.

MR. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. FINDLEY. I should like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his most important presentation, and to make note of the fact that it is especially appropriate on this 30th anniversary of the inauguration of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Our late President became noted for his deficit financing, but during his years in the White House I do not recall a single peacetime year in which he failed at least to give lipservice to the objective of a balanced budget.

MR. BECKER. The most significant part of it is that it started off with the idea that we would probably reach a balanced budget by this method in 1967 or 1968, but now they have even pushed this by the board and it may not be until 1975. Who is going to carry the load along the way?

MR. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

MR. NELSEN. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for taking the time to discuss the importance of a sound national budget.

I am sure the gentleman would be pleased to know that obviously the general public does not buy, as a sound proposal, the so-called planned deficit approach. I reach this conclusion judging from the many comments included in the many letters I receive. I think the gentleman should know that actually some folks are amused, feeling the tax proposal is ridiculous.

A quote from one letter reveals this fact very well—here is the quote:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Could you get President Kennedy to write my banker. You see I am planning a deficit in my budget and I am having trouble making the dumb cluck understand.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

MR. BECKER. I am glad to have a little levity in this, but the gentleman is perfectly right.

MR. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BECKER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

MR. HUTCHINSON. I desire to associate myself with a particular remark of the gentleman in which the gentleman points out that probably all unemployment is too much unemployment, but obviously our experience for many years now is that you do not lick an unemployment problem with a deficit spending program. The present program of the administration tries, as I see it, first, to increase the spending and then reduce the taxes. I suppose they intend to make up the difference by borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, it also has been my observation that a debtor is not in a very healthy financial situation and I do not think it is proper ever to consider a debt as an asset. Nevertheless, this administration seems to so consider it.

Mr. Speaker, a debt—the national debt in the size to which it has grown, represents to my mind the failure of our generation to meet the demands of our time. Practically all of the present national debt, Mr. Speaker, was created by our generation—permitted to grow by our generation, and it measures the extent to which our generation has failed to meet the requirements of our time and, yet, we see fit to cast that burden upon the future. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the future will have need of all of its own resources to meet all of its own needs without bearing our burdens as well. Consequently, I do not see how we can avoid the very elemental economic principle that you cannot spend and have, and that the way to get this economy of ours on a sound basis again would be to reduce Government spending, to balance the budget and to undertake an orderly process for the reduction of the national debt.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly would agree with what the gentleman has said. This is getting into the immorality of what we are doing. It seems in recent years the pseudoliberals—and I call them pseudoliberals because that is all they are—they want to spend my money but not theirs, to do all the fancy things that they want, but that they do not want to pay for themselves. I would like to see them spend their money to do some of these things, which they could very well do because their funds are unlimited. But they are in such a hurry to do everything now and to remake the world now. It took God all these years to create the world and mankind as we know it today, but they want to do this today, tomorrow and yesterday. But they do not care whether my grandchildren and my great-grandchildren are going to be able to build a sidewalk or whether they are going to have a bankrupt nation. They do not care about that. I say if they want these things now, let those people who propose to do the spending bring in an additional tax bill and place that tax bill before the people and be honest about it and say, "This project is going to cost \$5 billion, therefore, we are going to increase taxes so much." To me—this would be the moral way to handle the situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that your chief objection is that this is a planned spending deficit?

Mr. BECKER. No, sir. I am against deficit spending except when it happens as a result of a national emergency or an uncontrolled recession or depression.

I am against deficit spending. I have voted against it through the years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How would you go about getting from under the deficit?

Mr. BECKER. I think I detailed that in my lengthy dissertation on the economy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What part of the appropriations would you cut out?

Mr. BECKER. Oh, I would cut out a lot of foreign aid. I would cut out a lot of agriculture. I would cut out this \$5 billion for Federal aid to education. I would cut out a lot of things the people do not want and which they could get along better without.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would you do without subsidies to airlines?

Mr. BECKER. If we are going to get into this matter of cutting expenditures to meet revenues I could detail where you could cut out billions of dollars from the budget, at least \$10 billion, without getting into the matter of subsidies to airlines.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, what the gentleman is talking about is the budget.

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the tax bill.

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the gentleman is objecting because they do not come out even.

Mr. BECKER. No, that is not it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is not that the extent of your argument?

Mr. BECKER. That is only part of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do you not realize that after the depression of 1929 we have been engaging in deficit spending almost every year since then, including the Eisenhower years when we had more than \$32 billion in deficit?

Mr. BECKER. No, you did not. In the Eisenhower years it was \$30 billion.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Only \$30 billion.

Mr. BECKER. And that was too much.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And that was not planned, was it?

Mr. BECKER. During that time there were two recessions that caused a great part of that deficit. The gentleman will remember that in 1954 we balanced the budget with a Republican-controlled Congress, and reduced taxes. We did that under a Republican Congress. Under a Republican President in 1954 we balanced the budget and we reduced taxes nearly \$7.5 billion. I would think that was quite an accomplishment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is talking about the slump of 1955.

Mr. BECKER. I believe it was after that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is talking about the slump of 1955.

Mr. BECKER. I believe it was after that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman admitted to two depressions in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. BECKER. Not depressions. The gentleman referred to the Hoover depression. I would like to have him define what he means by a Hoover depression.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Hoover depression came when the Republicans manipulated the market.

Mr. BECKER. Republicans?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. When they threw the farmer and the working man completely out of employment.

Mr. BECKER. Just a minute. I wonder if Joe Kennedy should not bear some of the responsibility? Nobody made more money in the stock market in 1929 than Joe Kennedy. That is where he made many millions. He also manipulated the stock market. Was he a Republican?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was it not the Republicans who set up the RFC to help out the railroads and the banks?

Mr. BECKER. When was it that was set up?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In 1930.

Mr. BECKER. Certainly it was neither 1928 or 1929.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It came about at a time when every bank and railroad was in trouble and the man Hoover appointed at the head of it was Mr. Dawes, "Hell-and-Maria" Dawes, Vice President under "Keep Cool With Coolidge."

Then what did he do? The first \$90 million he lent was to his own bank in Chicago. He resigned and went home, as did every other Republican who had the ability to get close to the RFC, the railroads, and the banks. That was when the Federal spending got started, under the Republicans in 1930, 1931, and 1932.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman will concede that whoever started it, it has kept going ahead.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Eisenhower followed that philosophy.

Mr. BECKER. He did not. At no time did he follow that philosophy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Republicans had a \$32 billion deficit from the time he went in 1953.

Mr. BECKER. Again the gentleman is wrong. In the first place, the gentleman will remember we were in the Korean war in 1953 and there was a big deficit that year.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Is it not true that every President for the last 50 years in running as a candidate for the Presidency has sold the people on the idea, or told the people that he was going to have and submit to the Congress a balanced budget?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, yes.

Mr. HALEY. And it has not been done, has it?

Mr. BECKER. It has not been done, no.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Colorado, I would like to point out to the gentleman that the Democrats had control of the Congress 6 of the 8 years that President Eisenhower was in office, and that the Republicans have had control of only two ses-



sions of Congress since 1930. I do not think a Republican in Congress or any Government employee can be blamed for the deficit spending program that this country has embarked upon since.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman referred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and said it was created by Mr. Hoover. What kind of Congress did we have in 1931? It was a Democratic Congress elected in 1931. It was not a Republican Congress. If the gentleman wants to argue about the matter, let us look at the record. There was not one recommendation made by Hoover to stave off the depression that the Democratic majority passed in the Congresses of 1931 and 1932. The record is abundantly clear on recommendations made by President Hoover at that time. This is an exercise in futility, if we are going to try to discuss what happened in 1928 and 1930. I am trying to discuss what we ought to do today. We should get down to business today. We should balance the budget by having sane, sound programs, and reducing the national debt, then reducing taxes, but not come in here with some gimmicks involving a deficit that nobody can point to with one ounce of reason that it will work.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am sure the gentleman knows that in the election of 1930, and certainly in the election of 1928, with the Hoover landslide, you got a Republican Congress with him?

Mr. BECKER. That was for 2 years. The gentleman said in 1930.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is what I said. We had the election in 1930.

Mr. BECKER. Right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the Republicans had a majority.

Mr. BECKER. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. After the election and before the Congress came along on March 4, 1931, and there were vacancies, the Republicans failed in the special elections, and it was possible for the Democrats to take over. I think that is the history of it. If you do not believe what I am talking about, go talk to JOE MARTIN.

Mr. BECKER. I do not think it makes a particle of difference what happened in 1930. I think we should keep the discussion on what we are going to do now, what we have to build on. Because I made a mistake last year or 5 years ago, does the gentleman not think I should correct it now?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman has a contribution to make that is appropriate to the discussion at hand, I will yield to him. But if we are going back, it is a great waste of time, and I do not think we should burden the Members with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The contribution I would like to make at this time is to ask the gentleman, How does he propose to take care of automation and unemployment and not carry on as we have since World War II?

Mr. BECKER. Let me ask the gentleman this question, How did business provide jobs for the American people over the last 150 years? Did the Government provide the means for that? It did not. It provided a confidence in the minds and hearts of the American people. We should move forward and provide opportunities for the people. That is how we get along. Automation? Labor and business will take care of automation if we do not get in between them. I think I have yielded now enough to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BECKER. I do not believe it will contribute anything to what we are trying to do here. In this present budget I have indicated \$10 billion that you can cut. If you want to give a tax cut after that, all right.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in this respect: It is not where we have been. It is, Where are we going now?

I say this, and I think every Member of this Congress knows it: You can cut the budget which has been submitted to this Congress by 20 percent, and you will not interrupt any essential function of Government, if we will get the Government out of the people's hair and let them get back to doing the things that have made this country a great Nation—individual initiative, private enterprise—and we will not have the Congress messing into these things about which it does not know anything. The people will take care of them.

Mr. BECKER. I must say that I am in wholehearted agreement with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and I would only hope and pray that our leadership and our Government would get down to this basis. That is what I am trying to bring out today.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York for the light which he has shed on this subject today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to hear my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], comment on this item that has been bothering me a little bit:

The President, when he submitted his message to us, told this House, if we approved his tax program and the budget which gives us a deficit of nearly \$12 billion on the one hand and a big tax cut on the other, it would "strengthen every segment of the American economy and bring us closer to every basic ob-

jective of American economic policy." A tax cut and a deficit at the same time, according to the President, is designed to strengthen every segment of the American economy. My point is this: I wonder if we have discovered some new economic law under which we can operate the Federal Government? If we have discovered some new economic law, I wonder if the Members of the House who have indicated they might support this type program would not be good enough to write to their respective Governors, because we have a lot of State legislatures now in session. They are stumbling around in the dark. In Utah, for example, they are figuring out ways now to solve their school problems by raising taxes so they can balance the budget. In Utah we are working under some archaic economic principles if the President is correct. I wish someone could shed some light on this matter so we could cut our taxes and increase our spending program at the same time and maintain a balanced budget. Perhaps the New Frontiersmen have discovered a new economic law and they ought to share it with us all.

In his special tax message, President Kennedy told the Congress:

The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, underinvestment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment. The result is lagging wage, salary, and profit income, smaller take-home pay, insufficient productivity gains, inadequate Federal revenues, and persistent budget deficits.

The President was correct in every respect. These are difficult problems, the solution of which will try the best minds in the country. Since that time I have been baffled by the solution which the President and some of his fellow Harvardites have proposed. To cure two of the ills he itemized—"inadequate Federal revenues and persistent budget deficits." He asks us to deliberately plan a \$12 billion deficit and at the same time deliberately cut Federal revenues.

The Congress and the Nation are being told by the "wagonmaster" of the New Frontier that this great big budget coupled with a great big deficit and backstopped with a great big tax cut is good for the country.

Mr. Speaker, if it is true that the economic problems facing our great Nation, are shared on a somewhat lesser degree by our States, counties, and towns, why will not the President share his magic with the Governors, commissioners, and mayors who, all across this broad land are stumbling in the darkness, laboring under false impressions, and trying their best to make old fashioned concepts, like the myth from our Puritan past, work; and I refer to the myth that government revenues should equal government expenditures.

If the President has no doubt that increased spending, decreased revenues, and pyramiding debt are the answer to the economic ills at the Federal level, why doesn't he urge that all of the 50 States cut their taxes, go into debt, and spend 12 percent more this year than they anticipate taking into their treasuries? I believe the States have a role to play in the Republic, and they ought to

do their share of tax cutting, overspending, and debt building. Furthermore, we ought to get our 3,072 counties to help out too. If they would all overspend their budgets 12 percent and cut their taxes in one fell swoop, I imagine the rate of recovery would stagger even the President and Mr. Heller.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this House who intend to support this sort of White House hocus-pocus to immediately write their Governors, county commissioners, and mayors and urge them to do their part to help the President get the country moving again.

The plain truth of the matter is, that this sort of economic logic would not work for you, nor for me. It would not work either for the States, the counties, and the cities and I, for one, do not believe it will work for the Federal Government.

With the adoption of his tax recommendations the President expressly promises:

First:

Total output and economic growth will be stepped up by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself. Total income will rise—billions of dollars more will be earned each year in profits and wages.

Second:

Unemployment will be reduced, economic prospects of our depressed areas will improve, those presently employed will have greater job security.

Third:

Price stability can be maintained \* \* \* with increased profits after tax there should be less pressure to raise prices. \* \* \* Inflationary expectations have ended \* \* \* the balanced approach that the Treasury has followed in its management of the public debt can be relied upon to prevent any inflationary push.

These blessings are promised if we will but adopt the largest budget ever, build in a good healthy deficit and then cut taxes.

Many Members of Congress would buy a tax cut if we could knock \$10 to \$15 billion off the budget. But we have been advised that the program won't work if we try to balance the budget by cutting expenditures. Mr. Kennedy said in his very proposal to cut the taxes:

It would be a grave mistake to require that any tax reduction today be offset by a corresponding cut in expenditures.

We may well wish that we could solve all of our problems, that we could feed, clothe and house the poor, provide for the Nation's defense, and educate our children with this little effort. We cannot, except by effort, work, and sacrifice, accomplish these goals and we know it.

I challenge the administration with all of its economic experts to prove the soundness of their logic. Can the gentleman from New York further enlighten us?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I think I can shed some light on it.

Mr. BECKER. Just a moment.

Mr. BURTON. I think that is my point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman asked me the question, and let me say this to the gentlemen: This is the very nub of

what I am talking about. If we would get down to cases here in the Federal Government, reduce all of this spending and get out of local affairs such as urban affairs and this mass transportation business, and let the localities do it, we would cut our Federal spending by \$10 billion. Then by doing this we could cut Federal taxes and let the people in the States and the various localities handle their own money and spend it on what they need in those areas. This is what I have been getting at.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], thinks that to borrow and spend is going to increase the national income, and whether it has increased the national income? What does the gentleman propose? Is this what the gentleman is proposing—that we would borrow the money and increase the national income? I would like to know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I will yield to the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Of course, I do not want to get into the economics that the gentleman from Utah talked about and that the gentleman from Iowa is now asking the question about. There has been a change in the economics of this country beginning in 1930 when the Republicans dipped into the till to save the banks, the railroads, and whatnot. Now, in 1933 when President Roosevelt came in he opened the barrel wide open. He opened it to whom? The farmers represented by the gentleman from Iowa. And they have had their hands in the till ever since and he has not gotten them out of it. At the same time we created, or there was created in 1933 the Home Owners Loan Corporation. Now we have a Federal Housing Administration. Does the gentleman from Iowa propose that we should do away with that altogether? And at the same time we set up the—

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Utah and the statement of the gentleman from Iowa. They asked the questions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PILCHER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] refuses to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, but I have not yet finished.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to permit the gentleman to go back to 1902 in order to answer a question just asked.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I think you should know that there has been a change in the economic conditions in the last 30 years.

Mr. BECKER. That is the gentleman's idea. That does not mean that we have to like the change or that we have to live with it. Maybe we want to correct it now.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How are you going to meet the problem? Are you going to kick the farmers of Iowa out the window and refuse to give them anything?

Mr. BECKER. I am not referring to the farmers of Iowa alone, but we could cut this farm program by several billion dollars instead of pyramiding its cost every year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Are you going to withdraw the insurance that has been given to every homeowner that has built a home, until we have 60 percent homeownership now in this country? Are you going to do away with that program?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York refuses to yield further.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman wants to offer a detailed program, I suggest he put in the RECORD. I refuse to yield further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there are billions—\$10, \$15, \$20 billion, by which this budget can be cut. It should be cut now. Irrespective of what was done 30 years ago or 50 years ago, my children should not be blamed for my mistakes, or for the mistakes of my grandfather or father. If we can correct these mistakes, it is our moral duty to do it now and not follow what was done yesterday or last year or 20 years ago. Now we have the golden opportunity to carry out our own responsibility. The Members of Congress must have some idea of what the people are thinking back home, across this land. That is evident I believe to the President and his economic advisers today, because they really backed up on their proposals for tax reform. But they are threatening a recession if a tax reduction is not voted, in attempt to blackmail the Congress, if we do not pass such a tax reduction bill. They do not know which way to run now. I think we should guide them in the right direction. That is our responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one quick observation?

Mr. BECKER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] that we got the old triple A in 1933. It came from a Democratic Congress. That is where the law was born and that is where the subsidy to the farmers was born.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation, coming from a bourbon State, that it seems to me that "spending yourself into prosperity" seems to be analogous to "drinking yourself sober."

Mr. BECKER. I think that is about right.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in behalf of the



statement of the gentleman from New York and comment on his remarks. A farmer from Nebraska very much appreciates his position. If the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] were a farmer and had to operate a farm under the control program that this administration tried to pass last year, he would realize that Federal control of the food supply would cause many additional grave problems.

If the Congress had passed that bill it would affect 40 percent of the economy of the United States. Even though the farmers are about 10 percent of the population, the industries relating to farming would bring the total up to almost 40 percent of the economy. If we had allowed that bill to pass and an all-powerful Federal Government could have had control of 40 percent of the economy, it would be but a short step to take over all the rest of the economy. At that time whatever man was Secretary of Agriculture trying to run American farms by the seat of his pants down here at a desk in Washington would not understand the problems of the farmer.

For instance, it would be hard for some to understand why a 4-plow tractor will pull only one plow on different farms.

Federally controlling the food supply in the United States would put the American farmer in the same position farmers are in today in Russia and China.

I plead for the support of the gentleman from Colorado with 50 or 100 or 200 Democrats on that side, to gradually get the Government out of production and marketing. We ask you at the same time to gradually get the Government out of the rest of the economy so free enterprise can take over and do a better job of operating the economy of this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I will not yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. Does the gentleman have a question or a statement?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure we all share the gentleman's great concern about fiscal responsibility. I try to join the gentleman in trying to save some money for the taxpayers. I wonder if the gentleman will be good enough to put down on paper at the end of his remarks for all of us to study how he proposes to save this \$20 billion. He might find a great deal of support if he did that, I am quite sure. I should like the gentleman to give us all the facts, breaking it down specifically, on where he proposes to save \$20 billion in this budget. I assure the gentleman I will be looking at the Record tomorrow and I will be very eager to see how he is going to do that. He will get a great deal of support if his program is workable.

Mr. BECKER. In the first place, I must interrupt to say that I did not say \$20 billion, I specifically named \$10 billion. I said this would probably grow, if we went deep enough, to \$15 or \$20 billion; I do not know. But \$10 billion has been the figure. With just the few

items I have mentioned it went beyond \$10 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will we find that in the Record tomorrow?

Mr. BECKER. I have got it in the Record already. I mentioned \$4 billion in the foreign aid program. We can take \$4 billion out of agriculture.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman be good enough to break down that \$4 billion? We are asking for only \$3.8 billion this year in the whole foreign aid program. I would like the gentleman to break this down and show us specifically where he would make the cuts. Then maybe he would find a great deal of support.

Mr. BECKER. I will be very happy to have the gentleman's support, but I will bet right now he will not vote against one appropriation this year, the President is going to bring up here. He will not vote against it whether it has cuts in it or not. We on this side want to give you the opportunity to make cuts. If the gentleman from Chicago will refer to the remarks by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] he will find a detailed list of reductions that can be made in the budget this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to correct the gentleman to make the record clear. They are not asking for \$3.8 billion, it is \$4.9 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But I would like to have a breakdown.

Mr. BECKER. I have not yielded to the gentleman.

The gentleman made a grievous error like Democrats will do of only \$1 billion. That may be peanuts in his book, but in my book even \$1,000 is a great deal of money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If you break the figures down, we may support you.

Mr. BECKER. I doubt that very seriously despite the fact I know the gentleman might be sincere in making the statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Try us; let us have the figures and see what the difference is.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman, let me refer to his record last year. How many of our amendments on the foreign aid bill did you vote for last year?—not one.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On the contrary, the record will show I voted for every single amendment made by the committee headed by Congressman PASSMAN. We trimmed that foreign aid bill way down last year and the year before and the year before that.

Mr. BECKER. I am talking about the amendments made on the floor here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Amendments written on your knees—ill-conceived and ill-thought out? I went with the committee and I think the majority of the Members of this Congress went with the committee. We trimmed it, if my memory serves me right in this House, I believe, almost \$1 billion.

Mr. BECKER. How did the gentleman vote on the farm bill last year?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Sir?

Mr. BECKER. How did the gentleman vote on the farm bill last year?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe we supported the committee on that too.

Mr. BECKER. Yes, you are right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course, we did.

Mr. BECKER. That is all. I do not yield further.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think we have gotten far off the track of the central theme of the presentation of the gentleman from New York which, I am sure, all will agree was a very excellent one. One factor which might be pointed up at this time was the strange character of this planned deficit, so-called tax cut incentive which the administration is talking about. I think we might properly consider the proposed tax cut actually a bit of hokus pokus because, so long as we continue to spend, the Government is going to exact its pound of flesh from the taxpayer whether it be in the form of direct taxes or in the form of indirect taxation, namely, inflation. What we need to be concerned with here is the level of spending and I thank the gentleman from New York for so eloquently presenting this theme to us.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York on his thoughtful presentation. I would like to inquire of him: Under the proposed tax reforms, is it not less advantageous for a person to make contributions, to pay property taxes, or to pay interest on a mortgage? I have reference to my understanding of the so-called 5-percent floor under deductions. Will this not result in reducing the amount of interest and property taxes and charitable contributions that a taxpayer can take as a deduction?

Mr. BECKER. Of course; in other words, if a taxpayer has, we will say, taxes to pay or interest on his mortgages or charitable contributions, let us assume that these total \$1,000. Now, if 5 percent of his gross income is \$500, he then loses \$500 worth of the deductions that he is getting today of \$1,000. That is my understanding of it and it is why every property owners organization in this country took off after this. Certainly, if we are going to knock the props out from underneath all our home-building institutions, this is a good way to do it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman from New York for clarifying this situation. This was my understanding of it too. As a country lawyer, I have made out a great many tax returns for small property owners, and it seems to me this is going to discourage charitable contributions and home ownership. I understood from some of the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado that he took great pride in the fact that his

administration is in favor of home ownership.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman refuses to yield at this time. I have yielded to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Continuing my remarks, the point I am trying to make is: this administration has submitted a proposal, this 5-percent floor, which will reduce the amount of interest paid on a mortgage which can be deducted. Also the amount of property taxes deductible would be limited. This will discourage private ownership of homes.

Mr. BECKER. I think the answer to that is simple. The President and his advisers, at least the President, has backed away from this tax reform proposal that they sent up; and I am sure the reason they backed away from it is that if we are going to disallow the interest paid on mortgages and the amount of money paid in taxes it certainly will injure the homebuilding industry of this country.

Secondly, such a policy means we would be breaking faith with the millions of people who bought their homes and who have been paying interest and taxes because they are allowed deductions. We would break faith with them if we turn around and say we are going to allow you only that part above 5 percent of your gross income, perhaps cut in half the deduction you are now getting. This is not good faith. I do not think we are in any position to break faith with these people, and I do not think we should attempt to destroy our economy by putting hundreds of thousands of homeowners in this position. I think we should have a floor on spending, a floor on deficits.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the administration will no longer press for the so-called reform that puts a 5-percent floor on deductions?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman is asking me for an opinion I can only give you my own. I think the President's own statement indicates that, for he said he would accept tax reduction without tax reform. But let us not think that perhaps later on if we pass a tax reduction bill this year that there will not be tax reform next year or in the near future.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Another factor that enters it besides interest payments and taxes is the matter of contributions to churches, schools, and charities. Is it not true that this 5-percent floor will discourage that type of contribution?

Mr. BECKER. That is quite correct. Included is a person's contribution to church, to any form of charity that is deductible. That is included in this so-called reform proposal. It would mean a floor of 5 percent of a person's gross income.

Mr. CLEVELAND. This proposal discourages contribution to churches and charities. This discourages home-

ownership because of the treatment of interest paid on mortgages and taxes. Is this not part of a continuing attempt to do all things for the people by the Federal Government in Washington? Is this not an attempt to discourage local individual and private efforts to do important things at home?

Mr. BECKER. All we have to do is to look back over incidents that have happened in the last 30 years to see how this socialistic philosophy of government has been developing and growing. I do not know whether it was planned. Actually I do not know what was planned by this tax reform suggestion, but if they want to ruin the economy of this country all they have to do is to pass this thing.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to this: In the 5-percent floor under allowable deductions it is my understanding that various religious organizations, churches and so forth, have a method of tithing 10 percent of a person's earnings.

I have some of these people in my congressional district. Ten percent of all their earnings they give to the church.

So the gentleman from Colorado, who seems many times here to be anxious and zealous in protecting civil rights, I would suggest he also ought to be just about as zealous in protecting the religious rights of some of the people, because, after all, it boils down to civil rights also.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman is quite right.

I want to say something to the gentleman from Colorado. He and I have been friends for years on this floor and off the floor. So there is no misunderstanding about that. I may possibly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. That is a promise.

Mr. BECKER. No, I said "may" not "shall." I may change my mind.

May I say to the gentleman that during the course of this discussion I thought I was quite liberal earlier in yielding constantly to the gentleman from Colorado. I do not think I restricted the gentleman at all. But finally I came to the conclusion that he was attempting to utilize my entire time and the time others might want to use. That is the reason I found it necessary to refuse further to yield. We are coming down to the point where we will be belaboring our colleagues if we continue along this line. I did not take this discussion far afield. We cannot afford the immoral act of borrowing \$12 billion to give a tax reduction to the people. It is unprincipled, it is immoral. I do not think it is at all fair to put on generations to come a tax reduction now for things we have and perhaps they never will have.

I said we could reduce this budget by \$10 billion. Possibly you may build it up to \$15 billion or \$20 billion. Someone has suggested that. From the looks of the present budget, we could cut out \$5 billion for Federal aid, and a few

other things. You can easily balance this budget and forget about a tax reduction. I think the American people would be the happiest people in the world if we came in now at this session of Congress with a balanced budget. We can cut appropriations. Let us not vote a tax reduction which would increase the deficit next year. Then we will have tax reforms, putting more on their backs.

Now, briefly, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know how reasonable I shall be in face of the many statements made by the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BECKER. Is the gentleman going to attempt to answer all these questions?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will give me time, I will.

Mr. BECKER. I do not know that I want to stand here that long.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As to the farm program, the gentleman says he is against that.

Mr. BECKER. Does the gentleman want to know something?

The Farm Bureau in New York State endorsed me for reelection and I have voted against every farm bill to come up in the House of Representatives. I have no farm in my district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from New York would propose as part of the \$10 billion reduction to take that money now allocated to the farmers; is that right?

Mr. BECKER. No; not all at one time. You could take \$4 billion or \$5 billion right away.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is about all they get.

Mr. BECKER. I heard the gentleman say the other day it would be about \$8 billion this year including the surplus and crop supports.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Be that as it may—

Mr. BECKER. Let us not quibble about billions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Each billion is important.

Mr. BECKER. I know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Each billion is important even as to you and I. But the question that I propounded and the thing that I want to know is this: Since we have had a changed economic condition that started in the 1930's and since we have had a tremendous build-up in deficits each year since then, what is the solution when just recently the Republicans on the other side of the aisle were jumping on the President because he had not done anything about unemployment and stated that unemployment was up almost to 6 percent.

Now, the President in his message that he sent up here is apprehensive that we may get into another depression. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Would the gentleman just as soon we go into a depression and not have any deficit spending?

Mr. BECKER. I would like to say this to the gentleman: The gentleman says right now that the President is apprehensive that we might go into an-



other depression, or recession. Is that what the gentleman just said?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. The President is apprehensive. Did the gentleman read and hear the President's state of the Union message in January? The President spoke in the most beautiful and superlative terms about the economic condition of the country, both domestic and international, in terms most superlative and beautiful that I have heard in my life. I could not imagine that the President would be apprehensive over a recession in the offing. He said this in the event he does not get his tax reduction bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The statement about the large number of unemployed, uttered by some people on the other side—

Mr. BECKER. I did not hear that, so I do not know where it came from.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman know that unemployment is increasing and if we do not here in the Congress see that those who are unemployed or those who want to work get work, we will be in extreme difficulties?

Mr. BECKER. You bet your life I do. That is the reason I am prescribing the program which I have proposed today; to get the country off the back of business so business can expand and employ people. As the gentleman knows, in the thirties the Government tried this same scheme that is before us now. We started with 11 million unemployed in 1933 and in 1939 we still had 10 million unemployed. Only God knows that World War II absorbed the unemployment of that depression. So all of these synthetic operations of the Government will never end unemployment. Only business will do that. Get the Government off the back of business and I am sure business will solve the greater part of these problems.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. With reference to this discussion about unemployment, there are 1 million more people employed in the last 2 years. As I recall, about 235,000 or approximately 25 percent of these were put on the Federal payroll for all of the taxpayers to pay their salaries.

I would like to go back to this 1933 discussion for a moment, when the national debt was \$22 billion, and when the Department of Agriculture had 23,000 employees helping farmers. Now, in 1963 the national debt is \$303 billion, or \$305 billion, and there are almost 100,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture. In 1964 it is planned, along with the planned deficit spending of \$12 billion, to have a total of 121,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture to help fewer farmers. In other words, there will be more and more Government employees to help the Department in this

administration in a planned program of attrition against farmers.

I think back to last year when the Democrats in this House of Representatives turned down an amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] which prescribed that there should not be more employees in the Department of Agriculture than there are farmers.

So, it looks to me, that as the debt goes up there are less people on farms to help pay the taxes, and more Government employees to help increase the taxload.

One place we can cut and cut fast is the uneconomical advisory personnel in the Department of Agriculture hired to sell the farmers a planned economy program.

As one of my constituents said the other day in a letter—and I received almost 2,500 letters last week in response to my last newsletter; not a questionnaire, a newsletter—stating that this administration has taken us closer and closer to a democratic socialistic republic. I go for the democracy and I go for the representative republic. But I cannot go for these schemes that will eventually break our country as they will hamstring our private economy and individual initiative and put us into that kind of government which was never intended by the original founders of this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude on this note. Along with many other people I am extremely worried because of this theoretical tax reduction program and planned deficit. Certainly no one, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, can put his finger on any evidence that this program will succeed, because it is purely theoretical. However, we do know that the tax reform program, as I said before, was something that certainly had to fail, because they would have to break faith with the people who were assured in previous years that they would be permitted to make a deduction for interest paid on mortgages, and for taxes paid; particularly those two items. They must have known that they would be putting the homebuilding business out of business, and would be hurting industry and labor, and would be creating more unemployment than anyone could possibly imagine. But what worries me about these theorists and these planners who are offering this program is that in the budget of 1962 there was estimated a surplus of \$500 million. Now the President has said that business has been on the move and that everything was going well. Those were his words; everything was increasing—gross national product, and so forth. Yet, what happened? Those who advised the President were off in their estimate to the point where we had a deficit of \$8 billion. For the 1963 budget they told us that the estimated surplus would be \$1.5 billion. In the President's state of the Union message in January, he told us in what wonderful condition the country was; how well we were doing under his administration; but we are now running a deficit

of about \$8.8 billion this year instead of a surplus of \$1.5 billion.

That means that for this year their estimates will have been wrong by \$10.3 billion. That is for 1 year. For 2 years, it would mean a mistake of \$18 billion that they had made in their estimates of income. If they can make that much of a mistake in 2 years in their estimate of income—and they say that for the 1964 budget they plan a \$12 billion deficit—can anyone assure that I am wrong in thinking that they might very well make the same mistake for the 1964 budget that they did for the 1962 and 1963 budgets, and that our deficit for 1964 may run some \$20 billion or more, instead of \$12 billion?

That is what worries me and that is the reason why I think we should try to cut these appropriations down to a point where we can pay our expenses out of a real estimate of revenue. I think the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means will be able to tell more about this than can Walter Heller down at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my statement. I have tried to express my idea on this subject. I can only hope and pray that Members of the House will get down to business this session and cut appropriations, and reduce the burden on the people and then, if there is something left over, reduce taxes.

#### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, with considerable fanfare, a committee of the other body has been investigating the source selection by the Department of Defense of the General Dynamics and Grumman aircraft companies for the development and construction of the TFX fighter plane. Much publicity has attended this investigation. The publicity has tended to present in general a one-sided interpretation of that contract award. It has omitted many extremely important and valid considerations which well could have led to the decision which the Department of Defense, in the exercise of its very best judgment, made.

I have not desired to enter into any public controversy over this matter. Heretofore, I have refrained from doing so. Since it was a closed issue, already determined on the basis of the many complicated factors involved, there seemed to me utterly no point in following the course against which Kipling enjoined when he spoke of those who "Peck out, dissect, and extrude to the mind the flaccid tissues of long dead issues, offensive to God and mankind, like vultures over an ox that the Army has left behind."

Yet the continued daily repetition of partial quotes and one-sided comments in the newspapers emanating from this somewhat overpublicized inquiry make it necessary for me today to take the floor for the purpose of balancing the

public record with information which heretofore has been given practically no acknowledgment or publicity.

I do this not to provoke an argument nor to extenuate the already overextended discussion. I do it rather to protect the reputations of a very excellent firm in my own district, of another honored firm in the State of New York, and of a number of very fine public officials from the wholly unwarranted suspicions which this prolonged second guessing and the veiled and undocumented public charges accompanying it may have cast upon them.

The loser in this contract competition was the Boeing Co. of Seattle and Wichita. Somewhat curiously, the committee in the other body has undertaken to inquire as to why the Department of Defense would consider granting a contract to other firms when Boeing was interested in it. The Boeing Co. has been given numerous contracts for many defense and space programs. It has better than a billion dollar backlog of these orders today. It has never occurred to anyone, of course, to investigate the reasons on any of those numerous occasions when Boeing has been awarded lucrative contracts. The odd assumption behind the investigation in the other body seems to be that Boeing receives contracts solely on "merit", but a competitor could only win by some undisclosed chicanery.

One week ago today, the Boeing Co. was awarded a \$418,820,967 contract, described as the largest ever awarded in the U.S. space program, to produce 11 boosters for the Saturn V moon shots. Nobody has suggested that this should be investigated.

The award to build the TFX was granted after long and tight competition and after prolonged and careful consideration to the General Dynamics Co. of Fort Worth in association with the Grumman Co. of New York. Since the statements emanating from the hearing in the other body have included only remarks which would tend to favor Boeing or to be detrimental to the General Dynamics-Grumman submission, I think in the interest of a more balanced record and a fairer public exposure of the factors and elements involved in that decision, it is incumbent upon someone to list publicly some of the extremely valid factual considerations upon which the decision of the Department of Defense may well have been based.

#### VALID CONSIDERATIONS

Therefore, I shall list here a few of the impelling reasons which may have weighed the scales in favor of awarding this particular TFX contract to General Dynamics and Grumman rather than to Boeing.

#### EXPERIENCE IN SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

First of all, the Government had every reason to be interested in the contractor's proven experience in developing and producing a manned supersonic aircraft. Since the TFX is to be a supersonic plane, capable of flying more than twice the speed of sound, this would surely seem to be an important criterion. General Dynamics has produced supersonic

manned military aircraft. Boeing has not.

In the B-58, built at this same Fort Worth plant, General Dynamics and the Air Force achieved the greatest advance in the state of the art which has been achieved in modern times. This is the free world's only supersonic bomber. It holds six world speed records previously held by Soviet aircraft. Boeing, by contrast, has been producing the B-52 which is subsonic, slower in fact than the commercial aircraft in common use throughout the country.

The B-58 accomplished a greater incremental increase in speed over the Boeing-built B-52 than the B-52 accomplished over the aircraft originally built and flown by the Wright brothers.

#### EXPERIENCE IN NAVAL AIRCRAFT

Second. Since the TFX is to be a bi-service aircraft, for common use by both the Air Force and the Navy, it is only natural to assume that the Government would be deeply interested in the contractor's experience in meeting the sometimes difficult requirements of Naval Air Operations.

In designing and building this bi-service fighter, General Dynamics wisely formed a team in association with the Grumman Aircraft Corp. This company, whose talents are melded with those of the General Dynamics firm in this program, has built more naval aircraft than any other firm in the United States. Quite probably, at least half the total number of take-offs and landings ever made from the U.S. aircraft carriers have been made in Grumman-built aircraft.

Boeing, by contrast, has not been dealing with the Navy in the meeting of these exacting requirements.

Boeing has not had a naval aircraft production program in 30 years unless we were to count an experimental design of which only two models were ever built.

#### TOP PRIORITY

In the third place, because of the vital importance of this particular program and the necessity that it be given top priority by the firm undertaking its construction, it naturally would be important to the Government that its production source be in a position to devote its full and undivided attention to this individual program. The General Dynamics plant at Fort Worth, with its proven engineering and manpower team and its well equipped 4,000 feet long assembly plant, was in a position to give real priority to the TFX program since the B-58 program in which it had been engaged was finished.

Boeing, on the other hand, has so many programs going that its engineering skills and talents must be divided among them all.

Boeing right now has a backlog of defense and space orders that run to a total volume of several billions of dollars. Boeing had proposed to do the TFX designing and development work in Seattle, the actual production work in Wichita. Even the Wichita plant, relatively less busy, has been engaged in doing extensive repair and modification work costing the Government many mil-

lions of dollars on the failing wings of B-52 aircraft which it earlier built.

#### DESIGN COMMONALITY

Fourth, and probably most important of all, was the central question of design commonality in the slightly differing versions of this craft to be used by the Air Force and the Navy. The basic purpose of the plan was to design and build one airplane which could serve both services. Probably the most significant factor was the question of which design had the greater percentage of common and interchangeable parts.

Fundamentally, it was a question of whether we were to have one airplane or two airplanes. Secretary McNamara was deeply committed to the concept of one basic model with the highest possible degree of commonality. He believes truly great financial savings will thus be effected in the long run.

In this all-important criterion, the General Dynamics-Grumman design is reliably accounted to have been clearly and demonstrably superior.

#### GOVERNMENT INTEREST

In the fifth place, it surely is desirable from the standpoint of our Government to keep our defense production arsenal functioning. It is not healthy to give all the work to one firm and reduce the Government to a dependence upon one company. Obviously, the purposes of the United States are served when both Boeing and General Dynamics and the other top aircraft production firms are holding together the trained and proven management teams which have been developed at such cost over the years to our Government.

Single-source procurement is potentially dangerous. When we have only big-company producing in a given field, the Government itself suffers. A few years ago, the Bendix Co. was the only producing concern making aircraft brakes. That company went out on strike and many aircraft were temporarily decommissioned. The same thing has happened in the field of radar altimeters. It serves the public purpose to keep a number of good companies in active production.

In the absence of a substantial contract of this type, the General Dynamics team at Fort Worth was faced with dismemberment. Having produced the B-24, the B-36, and the B-58, its talents and equipment would have lain idle and wasted if it had not received this or a similar contract. Our Government has an enormous investment in the physical properties of that plant. It also has a far greater financial investment, and one incapable of calculation, in the 20 years of aircraft design and manufacturing which have resulted in the development there of a smoothly functioning team of management, engineering, and machine skills.

Employment at the Fort Worth plant had gone from a peak of 27,000 during the B-36 program to a level of only 8,000 at the time the TFX contract was awarded.

Without this contract to hold the team together, it inevitably would have declined sharply and drastically below that



point. A team whose members are scattered to the four winds is no longer a team. It was not in the interest of our Government to allow this to happen. Had it been allowed, our Nation's defense structure would have lost a very valuable national asset.

#### AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

In the sixth place, since naval aircraft carriers contain limited space, an extremely important consideration is the question of how many aircraft of a given design can be placed on a single carrier. Our number of aircraft carriers is limited. Therefore our total naval air striking power is limited by the number of combat aircraft which can be carried aboard each such vessel.

Since the committee in the other body has seen fit to make certain inquiries into certain selected characteristics of design, I suggest that in the interest of a complete record they should want to inquire into the question of which of the competing designs would have better served this extremely important purpose of allowing the maximum number of aircraft on each individual carrier. Unless I am completely misinformed, the General Dynamics design was considerably superior in this vital aspect.

#### UNINTERRUPTED PRODUCTION

Finally, it is only logical to assume that due to the urgent need for this new plane in adequate numbers as soon as possible, the Defense Department would be deeply interested in assurances of uninterrupted production at the plant where the plane is built. At the time the contract was awarded, the General Dynamics firm had just signed a 3-year labor contract with the organization representing its employees, thus guaranteeing at least 3 years of labor peace and top production unhindered by strikes and walkouts or work stoppages.

The same could not be said for Boeing, where management and labor still were in dispute and the possibility of work stoppages or discordant strife still unre-moved.

These are not all of the considerations, I am sure, which went into the decision by our Defense Department in the awarding of this important contract. But surely any fairminded person would have to admit that they are indeed considerations of the greatest importance. No doubt there were other things, and perhaps many other things, which had to be taken into consideration.

Yet since much of the publicity from the hearings in the other body has tended to leave the extremely erroneous impression that there were no proper reasons at all for awarding this contract to the General Dynamics-Grumman group, I thought it very much worthwhile and in fact essential in the interest of objectivity that the above facts be publicly disclosed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe the gentleman from Texas is making a very, very significant statement here today, and I am very grateful to him for bringing to

the attention of the House these pertinent facts on this particular contract. I want to congratulate him for the effort he has exerted in assembling the material and arguments on this very important development. I would like to associate myself with his remarks, because it appears to be obvious that there has been an effort to develop something sinister in the awarding of this contract. I do not follow that on the basis of the information the gentleman is presenting to the House. It appears that the Defense Department was perfectly correct and proper in its decision. I congratulate the gentleman for calling our attention to these very pertinent facts.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and appreciate his comments.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. PIKE. I, too, would like to join with the gentleman from Illinois in congratulating the gentleman from Texas. It is a rough job for any of us to follow the eloquent and articulate gentleman from Texas. He and I have shared in the past the kind of disappointment which comes when a major defense contractor in his district fails to get something, or something happens to one of them. In the case of the gentleman from Texas a B-58 bomber was phased out, and it certainly was essential to his district, and in my own case it was an F-105 fighter which was phased out. It was also essential to my district. We were keenly disappointed. In either case we questioned the judgment which had been made.

I think it is all right to question a judgment which is made by the Department of Defense in these cases from time to time, but I would like to add to what the gentleman from Illinois just said; some have gone a little farther than just questioning judgment in this TFX matter; they have gone to questioning motives. One sees in publications coming out all over the country in connection with this program that something is wrong with the motives for awarding this contract to the General Dynamics and Grumman team, and I think that there is a real danger that we might bog down so much on the question of the motives of the people who are working on this thing there will be delay and confusion in this essential program, and there is no room for any delay and confusion whatsoever. We certainly have had enough delay and confusion.

This is not like the phasing out of the B-58 in the past. That was a controversial matter. It is not like the phasing out of the F-105 in the past. That was a controversial matter. It is not like the B-70 program which is a controversial matter today. But it is universally agreed that this TFX program must be done. This is a program which every segment of the industry and of the military and the Department of Defense agrees must be done and it should be done as fast as possible. This is a plane we need and it is a plane we have got to build without delay.

I do not in any sense blame the disappointed people who did not get this contract, for questioning the judgment of those who put it where they did, but I want to join with the gentleman in a few of the specifics in this thing. It was not just a question of adding one or two planes to a carrier, it was a question of adding five planes to a carrier; and I submit that the five planes which are added to a carrier in this Grumman-General Dynamics—or respecting the gentleman from Texas, General Dynamics-Grumman proposal—might be the differences between yes and no in any given mission.

I would like to say further that in questioning the judgment used or utilized by the Department of Defense in the awarding of this contract, the judgment goes just a little bit deeper than the business of comparing what one company says it can do with what another company says it can do.

There has to be a complete credibility in the proposals which are made by any company in any defense contract. Our country has had entirely too much experience with defense contractors who say they can do such and such and so and so. Then time after time after time we have found that the programs which have been presented, when they are fulfilled, when they are completed, have cost 300 percent of what the original proposal said it would cost.

With General Dynamics and Grumman the Defense Department knows they have corporations which can and will produce what they say they can and will produce, and they will do it within the time frame they say they will do it in—if Congress will let them.

I want to associate myself completely with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I am proud of him for having taken this time for this very important purpose today. I think it is time we quit haggling about judgment and devote our time, energies, and resources in speeding the design and the manufacture of this aircraft which we need so badly.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman. I think he is thoroughly and completely correct.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I concur with the gentleman we need this very, very valuable TFX, sometimes known as the LBJ aircraft. I can understand the gentleman's elation also in getting this contract in his district. I am somewhat familiar with the TFX and the fact that the TFX was originally conceived in the Boeing Co. in my particular congressional district.

I would like to point out a few misconceptions here about the proposed designs of the Boeing aircraft and the General Dynamics aircraft. We certainly need the TFX aircraft, but we should procure this aircraft at the lowest possible price to the American taxpayer.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I inquire, is the gentleman leading to a question?

Mr. STINSON. Yes, I am leading up to a question.

There are good indications in the hearings that have been held by the Senate that there is a savings of between \$100 million and \$400 million by taking the Boeing design.

Also, I might point out that the bomb load capacity of the Boeing is much higher. There is also a design feature of the General Dynamics model that would indicate that this aircraft might suck up gravel from runways.

Reference has been made to the point that the airplane is smaller, the General Dynamics airplane is smaller, but the Boeing aircraft is somewhat lighter in weight when adapted to Navy use. This is a very important factor on aircraft carriers; namely, that the weight should be kept down to the lowest possible level. Also, the Boeing design requires about a 600-foot shorter runway to take off than does the General Dynamics design.

As far as priority is concerned, the Boeing Co. has ample people to design and build this particular aircraft, because of the phasing out of the B-52 program. The military people involved in this particular problem are all in favor of the Boeing design rather than the General Dynamics design.

I should also like to point out that the Boeing Co. has had a marvelous reputation of living up to its commitments with the military and the American Government.

I also point out that the General Dynamics Corp. in the last year has been involved in a financial problem, but I am not in any way being derogatory with regard to that company, because all companies can have financial problems. But it would appear, therefore, that the Boeing Co. has a capability at least as good as that of General Dynamics as far as fulfilling the production of this aircraft is concerned.

So for these reasons, I think, and would not the gentleman agree, that perhaps some of the criticism of the awarding of this contract is justified, and that there might just be a very small amount of political influence involved in awarding this particular contract to the General Dynamics Co.?

Mr. WRIGHT. Let me take these questions up point by point, if I may, and then I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The first point that is made seems to rely on the presumption that a cost figure as estimated by an aircraft company is the final and totally reliable figure as to exactly how much such a program will end up costing the Government. This simply is not true.

I think sad and checkered experience teaches us that this is at best an estimate only. I would refer the gentleman to the Bomarc program as an illustration that even a fine aircraft producing company like the Boeing Co. can be not only wrong, but considerably wrong, in the amount that it initially estimates to be the final cost of producing its commodity. In the Bomarc program not only has the cost far exceeded the initial cost estimate upon which the Defense Department relied. I think it also can be said without any overstatement that the performance has considerably fallen below

that which the designers initially felt it could do.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense and his Defense Department advisers have to ask this question: Can the company actually produce a plane by this design which actually and in truth will do those things the company believes and says it will do? Numerous times companies have submitted designs and with the submittals claimed probably in good faith that the plane or manufacture of that particular design would do certain things, and then those commodities will not do those things. This is the reason I say that the Secretary of Defense had every reason to weigh in the balance the question of which of these companies has actually been over this specific road and which of them is better able actually to know on the basis of its own demonstrated experience that it can design a plane of this particular type that will do what it says it will do. This is why the General Dynamics experience in producing the supersonic B-58 and the Grumman experience in producing naval aircraft would have been, in my judgment, valid considerations.

Second, the Defense Department must ask of each company: can it actually perform this mission for the cost estimates? The Defense Department officials, joined by the heads of the Navy and the Air Force, concluded that the cost estimate submitted by the Boeing Co. in this particular instance was unrealistically low; that it did not take into account many of the cost factors involved in producing a supersonic plane and particularly a new design of this type.

#### POLITICS?

Insofar as the matter of politics is concerned, that charge has been somewhat surreptitiously made before. I am glad the gentleman from Washington has brought it out in the open. Let me be perfectly frank with the gentleman from Washington.

Dark hints have been heavily leaked to the press that some mysterious and undisclosed political influence must have been responsible for the Defense Department's decision to award this contract to the General Dynamics-Grumman team. This goes back to the original assumption and prejudgment that Boeing just cannot be beat unless something sinister is at play.

Well, let us just briefly discuss the question of supposed political influence. For my own part, I do not believe that anyone is capable of persuading Secretary McNamara beyond his own best judgment. I should know, because I have tried it, and have been unsuccessful in the attempt. In 1961, after Congress had authorized and appropriated \$525 million for the continued production of manned bombers, I requested and gained an audience with Secretary McNamara at which I did my very best to persuade him to take the money and continue bomber production. To make a long story short, I fanned out.

As for supposed political influence, in the awarding of the TFX contract, that depends entirely on what is meant by "political influence." Webster defines

"politics" as "the science and art of government." In that sense, anything said or done concerning this Government program could be called political. I know of no other person in a public office who has been any more deeply interested in this particular matter than I have been during the past 18 months. It meant the difference between employment or unemployment for thousands of my constituents whose interests I am charged with serving.

Let me be completely frank. During the course of last year, I talked about this subject with everybody whom I could get to listen. Believing that good and adequate reasons existed for giving every fair and just consideration to the General Dynamics submission, I made it my business to try to persuade people to this point of view. I am not ashamed of that. I considered it my duty. There is nothing sinister about it. I made no secret of the fact. I talked with both military and civilian officials. I tried to be as persuasive as I knew how to be. That does not in my judgment amount to undesirable political influence. The same sort of thing was being attempted on the other side. If you choose to call this "political influence," then I did my best to engage in it and I am not the least bit ashamed of having done so. It was truthful and open and wholly honorable.

But I had absolutely no illusions whatever that I could ever have prevailed upon our military leaders or our defense officials to grant such an award to the firm in my hometown unless that firm had come up with a truly superb design and this is exactly what it did. Any argument I might have been able to make as an admitted Fort Worth partisan would have been utterly unavailing had it not been for the truly magnificent record of performance which the General Dynamics plant at that city and the Grumman plant have to their credit.

Let me further make it amply clear that any reasoning I used in this connection was of the type embraced in five of the seven reasons listed earlier in these remarks. At the time, of course, I had no specific knowledge as to the points of technical design comparisons. Every point of logic I made or attempted to make with any civilian or military official was addressed to the question of what would be best for the United States, and that only.

I emphatically did not employ anything which could be remotely described as pressure. For that matter, I would have had no pressure to apply. I expressly did not promise any reciprocal favor in return for the granting of this award to General Dynamics and Grumman. I am unaware of any favor which would have been at my disposal to grant even had I been so inclined.

Perhaps more to the point, I expressly did not threaten any type of reprisal in event the decision should have been other than what I wished. Most expressly, I did not threaten anyone in our Defense Establishment with a congressional investigation if their decision should go against my wishes. That is what I would call political pressure.



That is what I would call undesirable or unhealthy political influence. Perhaps we might inquire as to whether anyone is employing pressure of this type. I employed none, nor to my knowledge could any such threat or attempted reprisal have been made by any other person interested in the awarding of this contract to General Dynamics and Grumman.

Of course, I talked with people about this contract award. I talked with many people. Perhaps it would not be inappropriate to ask whether the Senators from the State of Washington are prepared to deny that they ever talked with anyone in our Defense Establishment in behalf of the Boeing Co. Specifically, I ask if the Senator from Washington, Senator JACKSON, is prepared to deny that his office directly initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials in Boeing's behalf prior to the awarding of this contract?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] needs no assistance in this matter. However, I rose originally to compliment him on his statement before any questions were directed to him because I think what he said needed to be said somewhere in an official area.

There were not only two proposals submitted for the TFX; these were the two that had final consideration. I think every major aircraft producer in the country submitted proposals and one of the last to be eliminated was one that was very close to my area. But I do not recall that any of these others who lost in this competition requested any congressional investigation. They accepted it in the competitive spirit that private enterprise is founded upon.

I have followed the TFX very closely because of my interest in research and development and all the information I have on it indicates that the idea for this plane did not originate with any aircraft producer or manufacturer. As the gentleman mentioned a few minutes ago it originated within the military services and specifically within the Department of Defense. They requested the aircraft manufacturers of the country to submit proposals on this type of aircraft. It has been under study for 1 or 2 years at the least and it has had thorough and considered study.

I am glad the gentleman from Texas has taken the time to indicate his concern that any time a contract is let there must be a congressional investigation to follow. When there is wrongdoing that has been indicated or charged, then I suppose we should have an investigation and possibly even in this case we may welcome it so that the air may be cleared. But I am disturbed over the fact that when a contract is lost the manufacturer should seek a congressional investigation, because I think this is the last place in the world, the floor of this Congress, where we should start handing out contracts for Government procurement. We have our job in a legislative way but

we are not the administrative or executive arm of the Government. We do have recourse in the event of abuses in this area and we should follow them.

I think the gentleman also has very well answered the question directed to him by the gentleman on the other side who has been querying him, but I rose, particularly, not to give the gentleman any help because, as I stated, he is well able to take care of himself, but to express my congratulations to him on bringing this into an official arena so that some sense of balance may be attained on this particular problem. I have been disturbed over congressional investigations and all that we have been reading about concerns the investigation being held, but we have never had the other side of the story.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for taking the floor this afternoon to express his views on the subject.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very grateful to the gentleman and would like to express my appreciation of his comments in that regard.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As one who comes from a district which never had an airplane factory, which never produced a plane of any kind, and which probably will not, a district which does not adjoin anybody's district in which planes are being produced, and which has no financial interest in this matter one way or the other, other than as citizens of the United States all have an interest in it, I wonder if the gentleman would not clarify, in country language which I can understand, some of the conversations which have passed between him and the gentleman from Washington. To be specific, is it not a fact that there has never been a bid made on the production of this plane?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is a fact that no bid has been made in the sense of any company's saying:

We will undertake to produce this total package for you as you request for X number of dollars and guarantee that it will not cost any more than that.

Mr. POAGE. That is what we country boys are talking about. When we talk about building a tank or stock pond we are talking about getting just what was described and about somebody's delivering just what he said he would deliver for what he said it would cost and at the time he said he would complete it. The Boeing Co. has not guaranteed to deliver this plane, has it? Nor to do so for a definite price? Nor to guarantee that it will do what they say they think it will do?

Mr. WRIGHT. To be completely fair, I think the Boeing Co. has proposed that they believe they could build the plane for X number of dollars. This could be more accurately described as an "estimate," however, than as of a "bid."

Mr. POAGE. Suppose I gave a proposal that I believe I could build this plane for about half of what Boeing says they can build it for, and I am so ignorant that maybe I believe I could do that, be-

cause there is a lot of money involved in it, and I believe maybe I could do it for half that amount. Do you think the other body ought to conduct some kind of investigation to find out what went on in the Pentagon, to find out why they did not accept my proposal?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken.

Mr. POAGE. I never have failed on any of my proposals, have I? I have never made any.

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about making airplanes. I never have suggested I could build an airplane for less and then found that the Government must pay about 300 percent more than I estimated.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am certain the gentleman has never done anything remotely like that.

Mr. POAGE. There have been aircraft companies which have done it.

Mr. WRIGHT. There have, indeed.

Mr. POAGE. I never have made a proposal to these departments that I could shoot missiles from one plane to another and bring them down, have I?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite certain the gentleman has not.

Mr. POAGE. There have been people who have?

Mr. WRIGHT. There have been. And often those programs have cost considerably more than originally estimated. Also the performance of such missiles has often been less than originally held out.

Mr. POAGE. We are still doing little more than throwing rocks to bring those planes down, is that not right?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that may be about what it amounts to.

Mr. POAGE. Could it be that some of the same people who have been so certain as to what they could do in the past, now come with a similar certainty and tell the Department of Defense with absolute certainty what they can do and how much it will cost? If so, has their statement been taken as an absolute fact? That is what I have read in the newspapers.

Mr. WRIGHT. Apparently some of the members of the committee in the other body have accepted at face value these statements without thus far giving the Secretary of Defense or any of those who advise him the opportunity of even explaining why they arrived at the decision they did.

Mr. POAGE. That is right; and the newspapers have pretty well dipped up most of the mud in Puget Sound and thrown it on the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. WRIGHT. This is why I felt called upon to rise this afternoon, certainly not to condemn the Boeing Co. nor to degrade or disparage that company. It is a fine organization. It has built some very fine aircraft for our Nation in its time of need. But it seemed necessary for someone simply to balance the record with some of these facts which unfortunately have not been made available to public inspection through

the media of the investigation and the press releases that have come out of that investigation in the other body.

Mr. POAGE. Now to give those of us who are not experts on this thing a little better understanding, has the so-called low bidder offered to post any bond that they could produce this plane for even twice what they have said they could produce it? Have they even said that they would do what they outlined in their proposal?

Mr. WRIGHT. So far as I am aware, and I believe this is correct, no bond has been posted nor has any ironclad guarantee been made that the final, ultimate cost would be that which was presented in the proposal. I might say in passing that it is not customary for aircraft manufacturing firms to make such bonds or to underwrite such guarantees because so many unaccounted—or unaccountable things can arise in the manufacture of an entirely new aircraft. But this simply highlights the fact that the Department of Defense is going to have to be free to judge in its own best reason whether or not a cost submittal is truly a realistic cost submittal. An estimate, of course, certainly may be far removed from the final, ultimate cost to the taxpayer. The Secretary has to award these contracts on the basis of his very best judgment, not solely on the basis of what a company guesses or represents that it could do.

Mr. POAGE. But the newspaper articles that you have read, or at least all those I have read, have indicated that the findings of a committee of the other body were to the effect that certain people could and would deliver certain results for certain money. And I believe our colleague, the gentleman from Washington, just said they would do it for \$100 million less. But he has not offered to post any bonds, nor are those in whose behalf he pleads about to make any firm commitment. They have just expressed an optimistic hope that they could do the things suggested in their outline. Is it not a fact that that is the function of the Department of Defense, to pass upon these proposals and to determine whether they are within the bounds of reason and whether there is a reasonable expectation that they could and would be carried out for the amounts suggested? Is it not the duty of the Department to weed out all obviously overoptimistic proposals?—and particularly is it not the duty of the Department to avoid a repetition of overoptimism from sources which have shown their lack of realism in the past?

Mr. WRIGHT. Precisely, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And is that not just what the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy did do?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is exactly what they did, and I am glad the gentleman has helped to make this clear.

Now let me move from this point briefly to cover one or two of the other points that have been touched upon, but not thoroughly elaborated in this discussion. First, on the question of who originated this concept of the TFX

plane, it is correct, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] said that the concept originated within the Department of Defense. This plane is to be built for the two services. It is Secretary McNamara's baby. It is his brainchild. It is going to be his window piece to demonstrate that effective unification of the services can be achieved. I think in truth, we must say that a lot of people in the uniformed services, the career military personnel in the various branches, met this idea with something less than overwhelming enthusiasm. It is only natural that those who make their livings by career military services identify themselves with the perpetuation and ascendancy of their own particular branches of the service. Therefore, it is only natural, I think, that these career military people or at least many of them, identify themselves with a separateness of their particular branch and with as complete autonomy as can possibly be achieved within that branch. That is what we were trying to get around when we created the Department of Defense in the first place. Some of the ideas that have been expressed, pretending shock and outrage that some of the military people might have wanted the Boeing Co. to build the plane, seem to overlook the fact that the Secretary of Defense is charged with the responsibility of making these decisions.

The notion that this idea for a TFX program originated with Boeing is inaccurate. It is like some of the other thoughts that have been expressed through the papers in this regard. Boeing is a fine aircraft company, but it did not originate the TFX concept.

One presumptive exposé written by a columnist who must have relied on utterly incorrect advice, asserted that the variable-sweep wing, a key to the TFX design, was originally invented and developed by Boeing. This is just not true. This feature, so vital to the TFX design, was, in fact, developed some years ago by Grumman, the General Dynamics partner. Grumman, in fact, built and flew a plane embodying this revolutionary design feature. The Boeing Co. has never done so.

Certain other representations carried in the newspapers during the last several days have similarly tended to distort the truth of what actually happened with respect to the Defense Department's decision. News stories have made reference to three so-called reversals or overrulings of military advisers by civilian chiefs. The three occasions to which they refer could hardly be described as reversals. They were occasions in which the designs of both companies were officially held to be insufficient, the specific deficiencies pointed out to each, both required to attempt specific improvement, and additional time allowed to both companies to come up with better designs for this revolutionary new concept in aircraft.

This could hardly be called a reversal of military advice. Some of the professional military people may indeed have said, in effect, that if you take either of these designs at this particular time, we would recommend the Boeing design.

But clearly it was a decision properly within the purview of the Secretary of Defense to determine whether or not either design adequately met the rugged, difficult, and rigorously exacting standards set out by the two services. On three occasions, neither of them did.

On at least one of those occasions, it is clear that the granting of additional time to both contractors to perfect and improve their designs would have worked to the advantage of Boeing. Boeing initially had built its design around a new G.E. engine. But this particular engine on which G.E. then was experimenting could not be produced in time to meet the desired production schedule for the TFX. Therefore, Boeing was given the opportunity to go back and redesign its proposed project around the Pratt & Whitney engine.

In any event, the decision to require improvements in design on the part of both competitors clearly has resulted in a better final production. I believe that neither Boeing nor General Dynamics would seriously assert that its originally submitted design was anywhere near as good as the ones they both finally were able to develop as a result of the long competition.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield again to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman.

I would remind the Members that the Boeing Co. has always lived up to its commitments and that is as much assurance as is necessary that these airplanes would be produced at the price given.

I think there is no question but that the two companies are equal. The Boeing Co. on numerous occasions has shown its potentiality in building the finest aircraft in the world.

Here is the next thing I would like to point out: Reference was made to the fact that somebody on this side of the aisle was trying to put some pressure on the military or on the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will withhold at that point, I made or meant or implied no indication that anyone on that side of the aisle had done this. I am not aware of anything that anyone on that side of the aisle had done in that regard. My remarks were addressed to the other side of the Capitol, not the other side of the aisle. I simply wondered aloud whether a gentleman in the other body was prepared to make a specific statement.

Mr. STINSON. I misunderstood the gentleman.

The next point I wanted to mention is this: No one on this side of the aisle has to my knowledge tried to put any pressure at all on the Department of Defense or the military to see to it that this contract would be awarded to the Boeing Co. May I say that it is a Democrat who is conducting the hearings on this particular matter and not a Republican.

I would also like to point out that the Boeing Co. was almost a year ahead of the General Dynamics Co. in submitting



the first design for this aircraft. So the Boeing Co. was much in the vanguard as far as submitting a design for this aircraft is concerned.

Going back to the political aspect, we on this side of the aisle would only argue that the aircraft be awarded to the lowest bidder so that the taxpayers will get the most for their money. If the awards are not going to be made to the lowest bidders, what basis are we going to use? Is Mr. McNamara more capable of designing an aircraft than engineers of the Boeing Co. or people in the Air Force who have been working with aircraft similar to this?

I would like to make a proposal to make this a fair program. Perhaps we should have the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. both build a prototype of their particular design. Then we could have a competitive program to see which is the better aircraft. I believe we would end up by saving the taxpayers a lot of money and would get the best possible aircraft for the Air Force and Navy.

Mr. WRIGHT. I cannot yield further at this point.

What the gentleman proposes is so completely contrary to established procedure, and so completely contrary to the contract that has already been determined and awarded that I cannot entertain a suggestion of that kind to be seriously made on the floor of the House. I would merely remind the gentleman of two or three points. Some years ago, after the modification of the B-36 program, when there was a need in the Air Force for a new long-range bomber to get there and back, there was competition between a number of companies. Among those companies were the General Dynamics Corp. and the Boeing Co. The General Dynamics Corp. proposed to make a supersonic plane similar to the B-36. The Boeing Co. came up with a proposal which is the B-52. It was awarded on that basis to the Boeing Co. Nobody suggested that the decision ought to be investigated; nobody suggested something crooked had taken place, or something sinister. Nobody suggested that this contract which had gone to Boeing should be taken back and divided up to see if we could not have one built down at Fort Worth and one at Wichita. Nobody suggested any of those things.

It followed its normal procedure.

More fundamental than any of this, however, are three rather basic principles in this regard which concern us all.

The first relates to the proper employment of congressional committees in such a matter. The second relates to our longstanding American tradition of civilian control over the military. The third concerns whether attempts at necessary military unification are to be forever frustrated.

#### PROPRIETY OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

In regard to the first, permit me to say that I have great respect for the committees of the Congress. That respect certainly extends to the committees of the other body. It extends

to the gentlemen who comprise those committees.

It would be unfortunate indeed if a great investigating committee which has done such notable and outstanding work in the past should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms.

It would be hurtful to the Congress if the impression should be gained that members of our executive branch or our Military Establishment were to be subject to attempted personal harassment, embarrassment, or recrimination whenever their decisions in regard to the awarding of contracts might run at cross purposes with the personal wishes of certain ranking members of congressional investigating committees.

Surely it would be a flagrant misuse of the congressional investigating power if the word were to get around among public officials charged with the awarding of contracts that, unless they want to be called on the carpet and attacked in the public press, they had better play ball with firms represented by members of certain congressional committees.

In this particular instance, it has caused more than a few raised eyebrows when the highly touted star witness, on whose presumed objectivity the committee's case apparently rests, turns out to be the vice president of a firm which was itself interested in this contract. Certainly I do not question this gentleman's integrity nor that of the Senator from Boeing's home State at whose request this unusual inquiry was launched and who had authored so many of the questions in the hearing. I am sure they both are honorable men.

But as one who is interested in the reputation of our congressional investigating committees, I simply say that we should exercise greater care to make sure that they are truly objective, that they more fully and fairly develop both sides. Our entire system of congressional investigations loses prestige and respect when one of our committees leaves the impression that it has first drawn its conclusions and then gone out in search of whatever it can find to substantiate those prejudgments.

I think it would be extremely dangerous if the impression were to be gained that one munitions manufacturer, now doing work on the Saturn program, the Minuteman program, the Bomarc program, the Dyna-Soar program, the B-52 program, the KC-135 program, and others, had become so powerful that it could cause a congressional investigation whenever it does not get everything it wants, exactly when the company wants it.

When questioning in a congressional hearing is directed along a one-sided line to adduce a predetermined result, magnifying one side of a question and ignoring the other, it unfortunately tends to lead to the above impressions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not disparage Boeing. It is a fine organization, and builds fine airplanes. But I do want to say it is not the only organization in this country capable of building airplanes.

I do want to emphasize that it would be extremely dangerous were we to get into a situation where the Government is reduced to dependency upon any one company. We have tried that in other lines of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to know something about a situation in which two companies are being maintained for the purpose of producing helicopters, the Bell Co. and a company on the west coast. Although the Bell Co. sometimes does come in with lower bids for the production of these items, the Department of the Army has held for some years that it is in the long-range best interest of the Government to see to it that there are at least two and not just one in the business with their tools and their machine shops going, with their skilled management and manpower teams working together. This is another thing that cannot be evaluated simply on the question of who says he thinks he can build it cheaper than someone else.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. PIKE. I would like to comment on two things said by the gentleman from Washington, I believe.

First. On the question of the Boeing design having been a year in advance. The fact of the matter is that, so far as in advance is concerned, the design was based on a powerplant that did not exist. When the fear developed that this particular aircraft might have to be built with this powerplant they had to admit they could not build it with that particular powerplant because there was not any such powerplant and they themselves had to change to a different powerplant.

Second. On the question of the lowest bidder, it sounds good—and I have sat on the Armed Services Committee not too long, but I have sat there long enough to vote against the expenditure of an awful lot of money that other people who talk about reducing taxes vote for all the time, but you cannot put out a contract like this on a simple contract basis to the lowest bidder. I submit to the gentleman if they did say to Boeing "Will you give us a contract price on which you agree to build these aircraft without any renegotiation clauses in it, without any right to come back to the Government for more money if you get in trouble?" I submit to the gentleman either that the price would not have been what the price Boeing submitted was, or that Boeing would not have submitted any price whatsoever.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a matter of fact, it has been reliably stated that, on the basis of price estimates alone, both the Boeing estimate and that submitted by the General Dynamics-Grumman team, were less than the amount the program had been estimated actually to cost by the Air Force. So, in that regard, the Air Force in its best judgment felt that the estimates submitted by both of them were too low. They felt that neither one of them actually could be expected to perform the total contract on the

amount of money that they individually said and thought that they could.

In the end the civilian heads of our Defense Establishment simply had to exercise their very best judgment. And this leads me to a matter of fundamental public policy.

#### CIVILIAN CONTROL OVER MILITARY

My concern in this regard lies in the protection of the great American tradition of the preeminence of civilian over military authority. A few of the quotations attributed to those who seem displeased over this contract award decision seem to bring into question the right of civilian heads of our Defense Establishment to make the final decisions. They seem to be founded upon a presumption that the Secretary of Defense and his Service Secretaries are supposed to perform only a meaningless ceremonial function and leave all the decisions to the men in uniform.

If this were the policy, there would be no need for a man of the capabilities of Robert S. McNamara in that crucial position. If he is not to perform the ultimate decisionmaking function, then indeed there is no need for a Secretary of Defense at all. Either the civilian heads of our Defense Department are to have the authority that goes with their enormous responsibilities, or they will be of utterly no value.

I am perfectly willing to concede that the average colonel in the Air Force probably knows more about the physical job of flying an airplane than Secretary McNamara knows. But I certainly think we all would have to agree that Secretary McNamara knows infinitely more about the tools, techniques, technicalities, and requirements of manufacturing and producing than any career military personnel in the country. With so great a share of the national budget devoted to military procurement, his great experience in this particular field no doubt was a primary consideration behind his selection for this responsible post.

Above and beyond the personalities involved, however, lies the more fundamental question of just who is going to run this country—the military or the civilian. Many of our forefathers came from nations in Europe where, by bitter personal experience, they had learned the dangers adherent in governments dominated by an all-powerful military clique whose judgment was presumed to be infallible and whose edicts had become incontestable. They wanted no repetition of that sad situation on these shores.

Nor do the American people want to see developed here the kind of volatile and unstable situation in which military juntas have controlled and dominated certain governments in the Caribbean area of this hemisphere. That would be anathema to our country, contradictory of our most basic beliefs and completely contrary to our truest traditions.

The history of the United States contains many recitals of the principle that the civil authority of our Government must exercise the final judgment. Often this has been done over strenuous objections of the military. In reviewing

the history of such decisions, we are inclined to say "Thank God!" Very often have subsequent events proven that civilian authorities were right and the military wrong.

The first repeating rifle for example was purchased for the Union Army by Abraham Lincoln over the vigorous objections of the Army Ordnance. This Spencer rifle was the decisive turning point in many subsequent engagements.

Under the same strenuous military opposition, Lincoln bought the Gatling gun which could fire 2,500 rounds a minute. The Army stubbornly refused to use it. Eight of them were left behind by General Custer when he went to Little Big Horn.

It was under the stubborn objections of the career Navy officers Lincoln ordered the *Monitor*. The result of that decision is history.

The Army General Staff was bent upon crucifying Billy Mitchell until the Congress intervened.

History is full of such illustrations. Today our Secretary of Defense and the civilian heads of our Defense Establishment confront enormous responsibilities in which the exercising of their very best judgment could indeed be crucial to our survival.

It would be a long step backward and not forward if Congressmen were to leave the impression that it expected the responsible civilian officials of this Government to abdicate their responsibilities to the hands of the military, or to be bound in all things by the advice of colonels or even generals.

#### SUCCESS OF UNIFICATION

In this particular instance, a further and final question of impelling importance arises. This concerns the repeated and continuing frustrations which have been encountered by those who attempt to bring about practical implementations of the Unification Act.

Secretary McNamara has vigorously prosecuted numerous efforts to create efficiency and desirable unification in matters of supply and program management. He has been attacked and criticized on many such attempts.

The TFX program is probably the outstanding case in point. The Secretary is trying to protect tax dollars. He believes that the basic concept of one plane for both services can ultimately save our Government upward of \$1 billion in this one program alone.

The crucial question in the TFX award was whether or not the Secretary was to be permitted to carry forward this program to the greatest degree possible. His essential requirement was that of the highest degree of commonality in the design. The General Dynamics-Grumman design more adequately embodied this feature.

I, for one, believe that Secretary McNamara deserves to be encouraged and supported and upheld in his determination to bring about the most desirable ends of military unification.

And so, this aircraft represents not only a revolutionary design but a revolutionary concept in military unification. We need these aircraft. We need them

at the earliest possible date. The program is vital to our security. Let's curtail the second-guessing and Monday morning quarterbacking and get on with the job of building the planes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong this much further, but there is one further thing I would like to say and then I shall yield the floor, having done that. That is this. I do earnestly regret that it ever became necessary for me to take the floor of the House to discuss a matter of this type. I did it reluctantly. It became necessary, however, because of the totally and completely one-sided publicity which had been accorded to the inquiry in the other body. It became necessary because no publicity whatever had been given to these matters which I regard to be strong and impelling reasons why the Secretary of Defense in his own good judgment may have selected the Grumman-General Dynamics team. I do not know that those were the reasons. I know that some of them were among his reasons. But I do believe that he is an honorable man, that he is an honest man. I believe that the Secretaries of the Air Force and of the Navy are honorable and honest men. I believe them to be capable men. I believe them to be doing their earnest best to promote the defense of this country for the lowest consistent cost.

I believe that in the exercise of their own good judgment, as charged by their responsibilities in this matter, they did their best to do that very thing. Nobody certainly can say that they have not. I am convinced that they have.

I say let us stop the quibbling, let us stop the quarreling, let us stop the "Monday morning quarterbacking", let us stop all this second-guessing. Let us stop trying to poke holes in other people and charging them vaguely with some sinister activity. Let us get on with the job of building these airplanes. We need them. We need them desperately. We need them in numbers as soon as we can get them. Let us join forces, unite, be both good winners and good losers in this business.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to yield further at this particular time to anyone. My allotted time has just about expired. I would not want to end this discussion on a note of controversy. What I am trying to say at this particular time is not controversial in this sense. What I am trying to say is that every American from whatever State has a stake in our defense effort. Let us be good winners and good losers and stop calling one another names. What I am trying to say is all the companies ought to be willing to be as good losers as they are winners, that they ought not to try to harass or embarrass our public officials when those public officials do not happen to go along with their particular private wishes. When a decision has been made, let us close ranks and get to building and move forward together.



## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LABOR DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this special order today to assure that the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor does not pass unnoticed in this body and from this side of the aisle.

The concern of America for the welfare of our people as workers and members of organized labor groups has found voice in the many great steps led by the Department to the betterment of conditions and enjoyment of our economy and better life by laboring men and women over the years.

In the increasingly complex times in which we live its functions have been many. Two of grave importance have been the strengthening of the free collective bargaining process and the safeguarding of the rights, opportunities, and privileges of all who labor.

To these ends, as with all its duly assigned duties and missions, we join in wishing the Department well.

In connection with the anniversary of the Department there was published in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 3, 1963, an article by Mr. Morton Mintz, as follows:

LABOR DEPARTMENT IS 50 YEARS OLD, AND IT TOOK A TAFT TO START IT

(By Morton Mintz)

Although the Government had been in labor since 1884, when it established a Bureau of Labor in the Interior Department, it didn't give birth to a fullfledged department until March 4, 1913.

The 29-year gestation period ended when President William Howard Taft, on his last day in office, signed the law bringing the Department of Labor into the world—a world in which the workingman, the workingwoman, and the working child needed all the help they could get.

Monday is the 50th anniversary of the Department. The anniversary will be observed with regional banquets and conferences in 16 cities.

The Washington banquet, which will follow other special events during the day, will be held Monday night at the Sheraton-Park. President Kennedy, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, three former Secretaries—Frances Perkins, James P. Mitchell, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg—and leaders of industry, the AFL-CIO, and the three branches of Government are among those scheduled to attend.

### TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

The law that created the Department said its purpose was "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

Today few would question that the law's purpose reflected compelling needs.

A 1913 Government report, for example, said that almost 30 percent of the Nation's steelworkers were on a 7-day week, that some worked 18 to 24 hours without letup, and that 2 out of 5 worked 72 or more hours a week.

The report said that 42 percent were earning less than 18 cents an hour, with a weekly potential maximum of \$12.50. From their

pay deductions were made for such things as ice water, disablement funds, medical fees, rent for company houses, and identification badges.

Owning almost everything in towns where many workers lived, employers could charge what they wished for rent, transportation, and even food.

In the 1st decade of the 20th century there were few laws governing safety, health, sanitary conditions, or child labor. Sick leave, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits were virtually unknown.

A common laborer toiled 50 hours a week for an average of \$11—and a child may have worked beside him under dangerous conditions. Illness or old age could cut off his income.

More than 40 percent of his take-home pay went for food, beverages, and tobacco—compared with about 25 percent today. A suit of clothes took 75 hours' work—compared with 20 hours today.

To the Department's 10th Secretary the task today is "equal in magnitude" to the challenges of 1913.

In an anniversary statement, Wirtz said that the Department "carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The Secretary said that we have today "an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions of persons, deprived itself of that many consumers, and come to an impasse of demand."

"As framer of the manpower policies of this Nation, the Department of Labor must keep pace with the scientific advancements that offer promise of man's fulfillment."

"We have the responsibility of developing those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole."

"We are going to have to review our seniority, our job-right systems, our employment security programs, and our retirement programs in order to find ways of insuring man's rights despite his displacement by a machine."

Of the four units that comprised the Department when it was born, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics remains in it. Within the last quarter century the Bureau of Immigration was transferred to the Justice Department and the Children's Bureau to what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Mediation and Conciliation Service has become an independent agency.

But changing times have brought changing needs, and the Department's activities and responsibilities are now of a scope that could not have been imagined 50 years ago.

### EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

They include career counseling for women, reemployment help to veterans, the U.S. Employment Service, training in labor subjects for about a thousand foreign visitors annually, apprenticeship and training programs, publication of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (a new edition will list about 40,000), studies of the chronically unemployed, thousands of investigations to assure compliance with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, help in retraining jobless workers (an estimated 400,000 in the next 3 years) and enforcement of fair labor standards.

"During its first half century of service to the United States," Wirtz said, "the concern of the Department of Labor can be expressed in one word: People. Human welfare remains its interest."

## AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLODY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in further recognition of the Department of Labor's 50th anniversary, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the House the heartening and thoughtful expression of Mr. Rick Lampella, of Waukegan, Ill., a loyal friend. Mr. Lampella is a carpenter, an active union leader representing Local 48 of the Carpenters & Joiners of America on the Lake County Branch of COPE, an effective Republican precinct committeeman and Republican candidate for alderman in Waukegan. Rick Lampella's words are as follows:

We are the hands and heart of labor. Our hands are the hands that helped make America strong. They may be the grime studded hands of a steelworker, perhaps the hands of a machinist, or the calloused hands of a carpenter, but always the hands of a free, dedicated American. These hands will never know the tyrant's sword as long as we are allowed to exercise free choice in a system of free enterprise. A system where men sit down together to negotiate their differences of opinion and to come away with an amicable solution. In times of crises, our hands will lay down the implements of our peaceful labor and will take up the armaments of defense.

Our peace and prosperity has not been cheap, rather it has been wrought by the sweat of the brow. No power shall ever take it from us. We are strong for we are free. We are labor.

Though our hands may be coarse and strong, yet our hearts flow with admiration and humble thanks to those who made our heritage so great. Our hearts swell with pride of accomplishment when we see mighty towering buildings, each one a monument to the men who built it. Our hearts never cease to wonder at new and intricate implements our fellowmen in the technological field devise for us in industry.

Above all our hearts flow with gratitude to the Maker for the blessings He has so copiously bestowed upon us as free laboring men. As time goes on, our hands will remain firm, our hearts sure, for our faith is in our Creator who gave this great Nation as a citadel of strength so that all men who crave freedom might look to it and be encouraged in their pursuit. Today we are strong. Today we are free. Today we are the grateful American laborer.

## MILITARY MANPOWER UTILIZATION: TESTIMONY BEFORE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity to testify before the Armed Services Committee of

the House of Representatives on the highly important subject of proper manpower utilization. I believe that this is an area in which we must give careful study and plan intelligently in order to avoid wasteful duplication of efforts and to provide for our country a secure defense. I am placing my testimony of this morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### MANPOWER UTILIZATION

(Testimony of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Monday, March 4, 1963)

I appreciate very much the courtesy this committee has extended to me to testify at this time on one of the most important subjects which faces our society today: proper manpower utilization.

I know of no one piece of legislation which has a greater impact upon the subject of manpower utilization than the Draft Act which is again before your committee for extension.

It is almost unbelievable that the President in his message to the Congress on Youth on February 14, 1963, failed to mention, let alone, discuss the question of the draft as it bears on this youth problem. There is no single force which causes more disruption in the education, training, employment, and personal lives of our youth today, which the President's message points up, than the draft law.

It becomes imperative to know whether the penalties that our society pays as a result of this disruption are penalties we must pay in order to provide for the defense of our country. A great burden is placed upon this committee to fully understand the effects of this disruption and weigh them against the benefits. Certainly the Congress needs this advice before it sets up more Federal programs which will interfere with the lives of our young people, as the President has proposed.

This committee will have under consideration this year another request which relates to the basic question of efficient manpower utilization. I refer to the request for increasing the pay scales in the Armed Forces so that the rapid and costly turnover of military manpower can be somewhat arrested. Surely, the high cost and military inefficiency involved in the rapid rate of turnover of trained manpower in the military suggests that this committee look carefully into all aspects of the policies of procurement, training, promotion, and retirement of the Armed Forces to determine where basic errors may exist so they may be corrected. I am satisfied that the most costly error exists in the basic manpower procurement policy which relies upon the draft instead of positive recruitment techniques. This is the matter this committee must delve into in great depth and not dismiss out of hand with a cursory review and set of hearings.

The third matter to which I wish to direct the attention of this committee is the Manpower Training Act of 1962 and the philosophy which underlies it. This act was the result of lengthy studies into the basic problems of employment and unemployment in our dynamic economy where technological advancement has been so fast we have coined a name for it, automation. There is no question that we must concentrate a great deal more than we have been on the subject of education, and training, both in preparing our people to enter the labor market and in adult education and retraining to keep their skills up to date after they have entered the labor market.

Probably the largest sums of money being spent in the field of training and retraining

in our society today are spent by the Military Establishment. The Military Establishment runs the largest single vocational education systems in the world, most of them in direct competition with the civilian society for pupils, teachers, and facilities. These systems are largely uncoordinated with the civilian sector and therefore are redundant as well as unnecessary competition. The armed services make the complaint that they seem to be training people only to have them enticed away by the civilian sector. They attribute a substantial part of the costly turnover problem they are experiencing to this fact; the obvious deductions to which I have alluded to be drawn from this should not be lost sight of.

I have been before this committee on other occasions to discuss manpower utilization. As the chairman knows, I was one of a group who strongly opposed the concept of universal military training in 1951 and 1952, not on the basis of an ideological difference, but upon the concepts of efficiencies. I happen to agree quite strongly with the advocates of universal military training that whatever personnel our Military Establishment needs they must have. I pointed out during the debate on universal military training in the House that the military needs for manpower were primarily quality needs, not quantity needs, needs for skills rather than for numbers. Our technology has continued to advance since then to make that point which was valid in 1951-52 even more valid today. A second point I sought to make was that a high proportion of the skills the military needed had counterparts in the civilian economy. Again, as we have advanced rapidly technologically this point is even stronger today.

This second point suggests that we should be doing a careful job of coordinating the civilian skill needs with the military skill needs. This requires as a mere rudimentary beginning developing nomenclature and description of skills both in the civilian sector as well as the military sector. Very little has been done in this area by the military sector. The same has been true in the civilian sector. However, the Manpower Training Act of 1962 can correct this if it is properly implemented by updating, keeping up to date and anticipating the new skills coming into being in the Dictionary of Skills which the Department of Labor is required to maintain.

Once the military has some understanding of the skills it needs in relation to the skills in use and coming into use in the civilian sector then intelligent decisions can be made on specific points of where the civilian sector or the military sector is best suited to maintain and operate the institutions of learning to develop these skills. As we move forward here we will develop a new mix, with the emphasis much heavier on the civilian sector and lighter on the military sector than it is today.

In opposing universal military training it was suggested that the theory of the high school ROTC program which worked well in the 1920's and proved itself in World War II could be used to develop a more efficient and less costly system to procure the great bulk of the skills needed by a modern technologically developed Military Establishment, than the universal military training concept which required the military to move into the entire field of housing, feeding, maintaining as well as training and paying the young men.

Universal military training was rejected by the Congress, in its wisdom, after hearing testimony from many educators and persons knowledgeable in the field of manpower utilization. It is apparent that the policy decision the Congress made has been ignored by the Military Establishment abetted by

those in powerful positions in the Congress who support the universal military training concept. The draft law now up for extension has been perverted from a system of satisfying the real manpower needs of the military establishment into an awkward and costly program of universal military training which does not result in a strong man-for-man defense.

I sometimes think that emotion rather than reason supports a continuation of this concept which so hampers our civilian society and provides such an inefficient procurement system for the military. The emotion is directed not to those of us who wish to discuss the problems of efficient manpower utilization but toward those who argue somewhat emotionally on their part that peacetime draft has no place in our free society. I do not wish to minimize the value that freedom has for us by eliminating it from the discussion but I do not believe it is necessary to make an appeal beyond one to efficiency to establish the case against the system of peacetime draft for military personnel procurement.

I want to get the discussion on the plane of what system is the best for our society. There is no question in my mind about the great penalty we are paying in the civilian sector in inferior education and training resulting from the disruption of the plans of our youth in entering the labor market and embarking upon their life's endeavor.

I also think there is no question that the peacetime draft has proved to be, as many of us suggested it would be, a costly, inefficient personnel procurement system which would result in an inferior defense for our society.

In these times of increasing needs of the military for high quality rather than quantity in personnel procurement, our basic emphasis should be on strong recruitment programs backed by a topnotch system of pay schedules, promotions, retirement and fringe benefits.

Gentlemen, in the early 1900's the Navy had recruitment officers at the gates of every Federal penitentiary. Largely as the result of the experiences in World War I and the wisdom of the Naval leaders of the day the personnel system was changed to one of recruitment of topflight enlistments and top caliber training with real career opportunities based upon a good promotion and retirement system. Granted the Navy has become a more technical service where unskilled and semiskilled personnel are in less demand, but so it is with all military services today, including the Army.

Adm. Ben Moreel pointed the way to proper procurement practices for post World War II in the personnel system he established for the Seabees in World War II, matching civilian skills with military needs and adapting these skills as the case required. I discussed this and other aspects of the problems of manpower utilization at some length in my testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1959 when the Draft Act was last extended. I ask that this testimony which is just as appropriate today as it was then be made part of these hearings. I also call attention to and ask that it be made part of these hearings an article appearing in Newsweek, April 4, 1960, entitled "The Draft—Campus to Chaos." I placed this timely article which sought to develop the points I have discussed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 7, pages 8446-8447.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 4, 1960]

#### THE DRAFT—CAMPUS TO CHAOS

Is there any sense trying to plan a career? Is it worthwhile to look for a permanent job? Should I get married? These are



questions that tens of thousands of young men graduating from college must face up to now, as they bump squarely into four words "Uncle Sam needs you."

For most who graduate from high schools, there will be time to postpone the question of military service. But what about the young men of 21 and 22 who know the draft is coming soon. Will they be drafted? And how soon? How can they find out?

Or should they just enlist and get it over with? Or what about signing up for one of the Reserve programs? And if so, which one of a bewildering variety of alternatives should they choose?

At sometime, almost every American family will be touched by the draft—now in a state of terrible uncertainty and confusion. For the first full appraisal of the draft, and its effect on the Nation's youth, a team of Newsweek correspondents headed by General Editor Jack Iams talked to students, parents, draft boards, and public officials across the Nation. Following is the summing up—and the answers to all-important questions:

The conscientious father in Arlington, Va., was both hurt and disturbed when his college sophomore son spoke up: "Dad, do you realize you've got me locked in with this darned draft thing until I'm 35? The other guys are just kissing it off until they're 26; and then they'll be exempt."

"I told you to do what the draft board requires," said the father. "To apply for a student's deferment while you're in college. Keep your grades up. It's true that makes you liable until you're 35. But that's the law."

"It may be the law," said the sophomore, "but the other guys aren't bothering. They say it's the only way you can beat the draft."

Father, sure he was right, reached for the phone. But the woman clerk at his son's draft board shook him to his conscientious core. "Your son's right," she said. "We just aren't bothering with college deferments any more. It's mostly red tape and the boys aren't filing requests for deferment. They hardly ever get called until they're 23 and they're out of college by then, so why bother? But, of course, since your son did apply, he's liable until he's 35. Otherwise, the liability ends at 26."

That is one example of draft law confusion. Another, and a more common one, is provided by 23-year-old Robert Reed, who was graduated from Princeton in 1958 and is waiting patiently at his home in Chicago's suburban Lake Forest for his local draft board to tap him. "Ever since college, I thought it would be just a couple of months. Then as time went by I thought maybe they had forgotten all about me. Two months ago I had my physical. I guess I'll be called any time now. I've been waiting so long, it'll be a relief." But, relief or no, nearly 2 years of uncertainty will have gone out of young Reed's life, with 2 years of active duty and 4 years Reserve obligation still to come.

Or there is the Detroit office boy, high school graduate James Gentner, now 21. "In June of 1957 I volunteered for induction. They deferred me for 3 months. They were supposed to call me in October that year, but they haven't done it yet. They may call today, tomorrow, a year from now. They've got me hanging." And while he's hanging, young Gentner marks time in a "just for now" job.

Another, and less resigned attitude, is that of 22-year-old Tom Taylor, a recent University of California graduate currently looking for a job in San Francisco. "I don't want to be drafted. It seems to be a waste of time in terms of career and the little good it does. I want to go into advertising but I can't get a good job because of the Army thing. I just hope there'll be a draft cut."

#### THE ODDS ARE 99 TO 1

These are typical cases, chosen at random. They can be multiplied thousands of times with individual variation in any part of the Nation today.

Few, if any, of these uncertain and badgered young men—and there are an eligible million and a half of them now in the draft age bracket of 18½ to 26—are unwilling to serve their country if they are really needed. But many wonder how great that need is, particularly when they know that the draft is currently taking fewer than 100,000 men a year (an estimated 93,000 in fiscal 1961). No wonder the temptation is to play "roulette," to lie low, say nothing, and hope to reach the magic age of 26 before one's number comes up.

But "draft roulette" is a game that plays havoc with nerves and with self-respect. Also, the chances of winning are slim. Right now, the Pentagon insists that "virtually no nonfather who is otherwise eligible is currently escaping the draft." The word "virtually" is a slippery one, of course. But Pentagon officials say the odds are at least 99 to 1 against the roulette player.

But even those who gamble on waiting it out are weighted down by what many young men consider the heaviest burden imposed on them by the draft as it stands today: The near impossibility of going into a desirable job upon which a career can be built. Obviously, the great majority of employers are reluctant to hire young men for positions of any real responsibility when there is no telling just how soon they may be plucked for service. Conversely, many of the young men themselves would prefer to mark time in some run-of-the-mill job—working in a filling station or at a soda fountain—rather than embark on a serious working life that may be interrupted at any time.

A dean speaks: The way a majority of college students apparently feel is summed up by Amherst's Associate Dean John C. Estey, Jr., himself an Air Force veteran of Korea and student adviser on military obligations: "In my experience in counseling some thousand students, I think I could characterize their reaction to the draft as one of uncertainty, inequity, and—I am extremely sorry to say—frustration and demoralization."

"They are uncertain when they will be called, if at all. They sense the inequity involved when they see friends with the money and inclination go on to graduate school, planning to stay deferred until age 26 when they will be freemen. They sense the inequity in the indefinite deferment of their friends who precipitate marriage and have a family, often with the sole purpose of avoiding the draft."

"If it is true that raw manpower is still needed in great numbers by the Armed Forces, this message does not get through to the college student. He does not see why he is needed. He reads about the competition with Russia in research, technology, engineering, economics, culture, and he wonders why his brains and training are not as valuable as his feet and back. Finally, he sees so many men being deferred for apparently flimsy reasons that he is bound to say, 'How shall I get out of it?', rather than 'How shall I serve?'"

Ways out: For those who frankly want "to get out of it" there are a number of more hopeful prospects than "roulette." Some are matters of chance; some aren't. Briefly, these are the main avenues to "freedom":

Rejection for failure to meet physical or mental standards.

Fatherhood. Actually, fathers are not exempt or even automatically deferred; but they are far enough down on the order of preference to give them what is tantamount to indefinite deferment.

Continuance of graduate schooling until age 26—providing that a high average is maintained. The fact that this requires money has caused critics of the present draft setup to cry "one law for the rich, one for the poor." Representative William H. Meyer, Vermont Democrat, has even compared the educational deferment to the Civil War practice of a draftee's hiring a substitute.

Pursuance of certain essential occupations, such as science, engineering, agriculture, and teaching. Decisions as to degree of essentiality are up to local draft boards.

The ministry, and study for the ministry. That is a flat exemption. It has raised problems, according to a California draft board official, with such sects as Jehovah's Witnesses, some of whose members claim to be ministers though they hold full-time jobs.

Hardship cases—again determined by local boards. About a million and a half are currently listed in this category.

To what extent any or all of these categories are being exploited by the unscrupulous draft dodger, nobody knows for sure. Draft board officials are generally convinced that the successful faker is rare, indeed, though the tendency these days is toward leniency, and as one put it: "We stretch a point not to create hardship."

But where the question of fatherhood is concerned, there is simply no way of knowing when a young man has cynically and deliberately got himself married and started a family strictly for draft avoidance. There are now 400,000 fathers who are as good as exempt. A recent Labor Department study estimates that 35 to 40 percent of the men reaching the age of 22-23 will have become fathers. Certainly many a parent must wonder uneasily if his son has made a hasty and perhaps foolish marriage, saddling himself with a family that he may not be able to support. One New Jersey father put it like this: "My kid, who is 22, swears that he wouldn't think of getting married except for old-fashioned romantic reasons. But in the same breath he talks about friends of his who have started families just to get out of service." And it is a standard gag among deferred students at the University of Southern California: "If your grades fall you'd better have a fertile girl on tap."

The job problem: If the normal course of marriage is upset by the draft, the normal path of starting on a career is even more seriously affected. The college graduate who wants a job as a steppingstone to better things is just out of luck, in a great many cases, as long as the draft hangs over him. It's true that if he is drafted out of a job, his employer by law must rehire him when he is free. But the fact is that most employers don't want to hire a 1-A in the first place.

Large companies with elaborate personnel systems are inclined to insist that draft imminence is no factor in their hiring policies. But a far more widespread attitude was bluntly put by the San Francisco Bank of America's vice president, Frank E. Young: "We usually wait until a young man has completed his draft requirements. If you take a man and put him through training and then let him go off for 2 years in the Army, we have to start him again from scratch and this isn't worthwhile."

Employment agencies are still more outspoken. An official of Detroit's Action Center put it: "Many employers express the stipulation that employees be 4-F or have completed military training. It is rather prevalent as a stipulation."

The fresh college graduates themselves say flatly there is almost no chance of getting a decent job—one that will lead anywhere—during the months of limbo between the bright day of graduation and the dark one when Uncle Sam's greetings arrive. What burns up the eligibles is that during this

same period their friends who are rejected as unfit or who have become fathers are walking into the jobs of their choice and getting a long head start.

How vital? This disruption over the draft during what is, nominally anyway, the peacetime American way of life, raises a basic national question: What justification is there for continuing a law passed in a time of stress, namely 1940?

The very history of that law provides a partial answer. It was dropped at the beginning of 1947. It was renewed 15 months later, in 1948, when the Soviet aggression threat appeared clear and present. Even then the law's teeth were not really felt until the summer of 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean war. In September of that year, 50,000 were called up (compared with the presently monthly average of about 7,500).

The draft law has been renewed five times since then, most recently in February of last year for another 4-year stretch, until July 1, 1963. (It was no accident that Congress chose to set a nonelection year for the next bubbling up of the controversial issue.)

Baby crop: There was some opposition to renewal in Congress last time. There will almost certainly be more in 1963—barring some world upheaval—because that's when the postwar bumper baby crop will start crowding the registration lists. That means that the draft, purely in terms of providing the armed services with manpower, will be only a drop in the bucket. For that matter, it isn't much more than a drop in the bucket today, providing as it does less than 100,000 men annually to a total defense manpower of 2.5 million.

If that is so, why is the draft necessary even now?

Defense officials, led by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, have plenty of answers, but they mostly boil down to this: If it weren't for the hot breath of the draft, volunteer enlistments would drop far below the point of sufficiency.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane, in charge of manpower and reserves, put it simply: "Even if we don't take many people in the draft, we need it for a proper flow of enlistments. The Armed Forces would dwindle if you removed that impetus. We would never have time in an emergency to rebuild a Selective Service System if it were dissipated. Selective Service is the machinery in being, a pillar of our ability to mobilize manpower in an emergency." It is a hard argument to answer. One answer may come from England; there conscription has been abolished as of the end of this year, on the ground that sufficient volunteers are available to meet Britain's military commitments—and provide more efficient forces. But skeptical American officials reply that results of the British experiment won't be known for another 2 years.

It should also be stated, on the side of the draft, that the civilian officials who carry out most of the actual, backbreaking work of administering the law do a first-class, thoughtful, considerate job ("a beautiful job," says Georgia Tech's Dean Fred Ajax)—and furthermore, the bulk of them do it without pay.

Nevertheless, the great problems of disruption, delay, uncertainty, confusion, and general demoralization, where the flower of the Nation's young manhood is concerned, are undeniably present, casting their shadows across a nation opposed since its birth to the militaristic tradition. What can be done about it?

Two presidential aspirants have ideas on the subject:

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY says: "I am not at all satisfied with the present law.

One immediate step should be taken. Our whole program should be reviewed and revised by a special manpower commission of civilian members."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the candidate most deeply immersed in defense problems, says: "A force made up of volunteer professional military personnel is more effective and less costly than one dependent upon involuntary draftees. If the current atmosphere of complacency were dissolved, and a military career made more respected and attractive, the draft could be eliminated."

Keep it: Vice President Richard Nixon, on the other hand, has never changed from the position he voiced in 1956, when he said there was no "easy way" to maintain defense, and the draft, however hard a way, was indispensable to national security.

The average youngster, for all his grumbling, knows full well that behind all the confusion and uncertainty of the draft, behind the rosy promises of service recruiting officers, behind the inequities and the skulduggery and the smart-guy stuff, there lies the simple, basic need of his country's welfare. His complaint is not: "Why should I serve?" It is: "Tell me when and how I should serve, and to the best of my ability." He doesn't want his time wasted—and his time, in the long run, is the Nation's time.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubts it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its un-descriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, volume 97, part 3, pages 3220-3222 and pages 3786-3787 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; volume 98, part 2, pages 6174-1678; volume 101, part 5, pages 6497-6498; and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician, who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military

uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close-order military drill skills, indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.



"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operators or not, and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer \* \* \* likely not \* \* \* so the skill is lost \* \* \* (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happens to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment

over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90-percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A-1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: The cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice. Set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a Reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal

with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the education system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce, saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

The committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

#### EXERCISE IN FUTILITY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is an exercise in futility and I have called upon the State Department to explain to the American people why it would even entertain the thought of granting a \$1.5 billion loan, or any sum, to Brazil, or any other country, to develop a trade program between that country and Russia.

A delegation from Brazil was scheduled to visit the United States today for the purpose of negotiating a \$1.5 billion loan from the United States to help develop long-term trade between Russia and Brazil; however, the visit has been delayed.

During these days when we are so concerned with Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere; when our national leaders state publicly that the United States will not tolerate Communist expansion into Latin America; when the administration is calling for \$11 billion of the taxpayers' money to help Latin America combat communism; why in the name of commonsense would the State Department even consider any such loan.

This dramatically demonstrates the futility of our foreign policy.

We spend billions on our defense to combat communism; we spend billions to help other nations combat communism; this Government is sacrificing American lives in Vietnam to combat communism; yet, our State Department apparently does not realize that the expansion of Russian trade, a very effective cold war weapon, will enhance the spread of communism and completely nullify the advantage, if any, of making these vast expenditures of money and American lives.

I think the American people are entitled to an explanation. I think the American taxpayer should be aware of the muddled philosophy of those in the State Department who advocate such a policy, and I think we should be told just who such persons are and why they would even entertain such a meeting.

This situation affects not only our security and fight versus communism, but also our own deficit financing and balance-of-payments problem.

#### BEWARE OF DANGEROUS CURVES ON PAPER

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been a deluge of statistics emanating from the Soviet Union which, if taken at face value, seem to indicate that Russia is really on the move in almost every area of activity. The latest of these statistics show that during 1961 the number of telephones in the Soviet Union increased by 19 percent—the most rapid percentage increase made by any major nation. On this basis, the United States increased 4.1 percent for the year. Considering only these raw percentage figures, some people might try to make us think the United States is falling sadly behind. But, we should all know this is ridiculous.

The current issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly effectively "bells the cat" on the use of percentage increase to try to compare growth. It points out that when you start with nothing—or nearly nothing—it does not take much to show a phenomenal rise percentagewise in almost anything.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the United States still has over half the telephones in the entire world. We have 42 phones per 100 population as compared with about 2 per 100 population in Russia. Even though we have 21 times more telephones for each 100 Americans, the real important point is that this is being accomplished by American enterprise and private initiative rather than some heavyhanded bureaucracy as in the Soviet Union. History will bear out the fact that our free enterprise type of economy has been the most productive in the course of civilization in supplying the needs of the people and contributing to their well-being.

Trying to use Soviet percentage increase statistics for comparisons with the United States reminds me of the well-known line about the billiard game in Gilbert and Sullivan's "The Mikado"—playing with a cloth untrue, a twisted cue, and elliptical billiard balls. The author of the statement in Public Utilities Fortnightly warns, "Don't rely too much on curves." I might add that to use such percentage figures is actually throwing a curve and we had better beware.

I agree wholeheartedly with the thought of the author that all of us should keep the proper perspective when some individuals try to tell us—after a pilgrimage to Moscow—the Soviets are going to overtake us in the electric energy field.

Mr. Speaker, this interesting statement in Public Utilities Fortnightly would be so useful for all of us to keep in mind when we hear any individual try to use such scare statistics about the Soviet Union in an attempt to play down or minimize the outstanding accomplishments of our free enterprise system. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point with the suggestion that each of my colleagues read it and remember it well:

#### BEWARE OF DANGEROUS CURVES ON PAPER

Did you know that as of January 1, 1962, the number of telephones in the Soviet Union had increased 19 percent over 1961? This was by far the greatest, most rapid increase shown of any major country in the world (meaning those with more than a half million telephones). The runnerup for statistical honors in the percentage increase race was Japan, whose total number of phones in 1962 was 14.8 over 1961.

Compared on this same basis, the United States makes a pretty sorry showing, indeed—only 4.1 percent—the third worst record for percentage increase of 25 other major countries. Only Brazil (with 2.3 percent) and South Africa (with 3.5 percent) show smaller increases percentagewise. There is no telling what an imaginative statistician might do if he were let loose with such short-range comparisons and plenty of curve charting paper.

Our only point in bringing up this silly comparison—and it is silly, admittedly—is to point out that when you start from nothing, or nearly nothing, it does not take much to show a phenomenal rise percentagewise. The really significant fact is that well over half the telephones in the entire world (150 million) are right here in the United States (77.4 million). And whereas there are about 42 telephones for every 100 persons in this country, there are only a little over 2 phones for every 100 persons in Soviet Russia.

We would do well to bear such sane figures in mind the next time some sensation-seeking Government official tries to get us all hot and bothered about the great progress Russia is making in electrification. Fears that the Reds will overtake us at the bus bar are freely thrown around the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But the hard fact is that Uncle Sam now has around 200 million kilowatts capacity (as against about 75 million for Russia) and produces three times as many kilowatt-hours for a much smaller population. The moral is: Don't rely too much on curves for tomorrow unless there is some real meat in the sandwich for today.

#### STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee conducted a press conference this morning at which I outlined our plans and hopes for sizable and meaningful reductions in the budget for the 1964 fiscal year.

I wish to include my statement with my remarks, but first, let me relate the background of this effort.

Immediately upon receipt of the President's budget message, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who is the ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee, called together the minority members of the committee.

We met to discuss the budget and share our views on how it might be possible to hold Federal spending within bounds. The problem, quite frankly, was as staggering as the size of the proposed spending, itself.

The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JENSEN, therefore, appointed a subcommittee of six men, of which I am the chairman, to conduct a detailed, line-by-line survey of the budget and make firm recommendations as to where savings could be made. Our subcommittee soon became known as a task force, and it is under that title that we made our statement to the press today.

After several weeks of careful analysis, with the expert help of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, and others, we believe that a budget reduction of from \$10 to \$15 billion can be achieved.

Other members of the task force are the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Following is the text of our statement to the press today:

#### STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK T. BOW, OF OHIO, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL TASK FORCE OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The President's budget for the fiscal year 1964 has been before the Congress for nearly 7 weeks. During this period the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee have been carefully analyzing the voluminous documentation of the staggering budget request for \$108 billion in new spending authority and \$99 billion in actual expenditures for next year.

We have obtained expert assistance in our analysis of this budget, in the person of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget from 1958 to 1961. His services as an adviser have been of inestimable value to us. In addition, we have consulted with dozens of other persons in various walks of life who are familiar with various aspects of Government spending.

We have concluded from this study that it is not only feasible, but urgent in the national interest, to reduce substantially the President's budget request. Our preliminary conclusion is that new spending authority can be reduced by a magnitude of from \$10 to \$15 billion. A reduction in appropriations of such magnitude would result in an expenditure reduction of from \$4 to \$6 billion in 1964 and of \$6 to \$9 billion in subsequent years.

The Republican members of House Appropriations are prepared to submit detailed amendments to the budget to achieve this objective. We believe that if such reductions are not achieved, the chances of congressional approval of a tax cut at this session will be almost nil. The American people have become deeply alarmed at the prospect of continued heavy deficit financing in a time of high national output. While everyone desperately desires tax reduction,



the American people do not want this to be at the expense of their children in the form of a steadily mounting, staggering national debt. We are conscious of the fact that many of our colleagues in the majority party are equally concerned, and we will welcome their assistance as this program develops.

To understand the magnitude of the fiscal 1964 budget proposals, let us look at the record.

Prior to the submission of this budget, the largest expenditure in our Nation's history was in fiscal 1945 when we spent \$98 billion to end World War II. The fiscal 1964 budget proposes the expenditure of nearly \$99 billion, an all-time high, with no shooting war in progress and no recession to fight.

The expenditures proposed in this budget are almost exactly three times as great as those of postwar fiscal 1948.

The expenditures proposed in this budget will be \$22.3 billion higher than in fiscal 1960, the last full Eisenhower year. This is an increase of almost 30 percent.

These proposed increases in expenditures are reflected in all departments of the Government if the budget is adopted:

Defense expenditures will be up \$9.7 billion since fiscal 1960.

Space expenditures will rise \$3.8 billion in the same period.

All other expenditures will be up \$7.5 billion over fiscal 1960.

The Federal payroll will have added 215,000 people since 1960, in addition to 220,000 in the armed services.

Perhaps an even more serious implication for the future is found in the new spending authority (which is the form of congressional appropriations) requested in the fiscal 1964 budget. These new "obligational authority" requests are a forecast of expenditure levels for future years.

New spending authority requested in fiscal 1964 is \$108 billion, a fantastic \$27.2 billion or 34 percent higher than for the last Eisenhower budget, just 2 years ago.

These increases in "new obligational authority," which are nearly \$10 billion higher than proposed 1964 expenditures, are woven into the entire fabric of Government, and would irrevocably be reflected in fiscal 1965 budget expenditures of well over \$100 billion.

In concluding that a \$10 to \$15 billion cut in new spending authorizations could be made, we applied the following basic principles:

1. Limitation of personnel additions in 1964 to requirements of nondeferable workload increases such as may be caused by recent new legislation, or for law enforcement or protection of property, or high priority objectives.

2. Absorption by all agencies of the half year payroll increases effective January 1, 1964, even though this necessitates personnel attrition or other expense economies; this was stipulated in the pay legislation.

3. Postponement of a considerable portion of new nonemergency construction, both civil and military; and some stretchout of previously authorized capital outlays.

4. A moratorium on initiation of new programs not essential for the national welfare or security.

5. Conscious reappraisal of continuing programs and services, with a view to reducing those of low priority and leveling out temporarily those (like research) which have enlarged substantially in recent years.

Applying these principles could not be said to produce an austere budget. The result of taking all the reductions indicated would still be a 1964 expenditure level equal in the aggregate to that of 1963, for the budget as a whole. Only by holding the dimensions of spending to a fixed level for a few years, while annual revenues grow, will it be possible to bring about a balanced budget again.

With all the budgetary growth the past few years, it is inconceivable that the reductions contemplated would harm the economy or the security or the welfare of the Nation. All real needs of the Nation can be met without attempting to satisfy everybody's demands on the Federal Treasury.

#### CUTS IN FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] earlier today has asked for some examples of places where spending can be cut. May I suggest that potential spending in any of the fields hereinafter listed are examples of past spending which might well bear scrutiny to see if any of these appear in the projected budget submitted to this Congress.

This list does not include losses incurred by the Federal Government due to its business activities in some fields wherein the Government is in direct competition with private enterprise.

First. A grant totaling \$65,000 in Polish zlotys given for agriculture research—U.S. Department of Agriculture, daily summary, July 5, 1962.

Second. An item of \$9,483,000 for redevelopment of an Oklahoma lake as a tourist center given under the administration's area redevelopment program.

Third. An untold amount to construct a solar-powered ship to win friends and influence people along the rivers of Surinam—House Foreign Operations Subcommittee Report No. 2436, part 1, September 19, 1962.

Fourth. One thousand 23-inch television sets ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped overseas areas were ordered at a cost of \$400,000 for areas where there was no electrical power supply—House Foreign Operations Subcommittee Report No. 2436, part 1, September 19, 1962.

Fifth. Studies by the National Institutes of Health provided for:

Indian caste cohesiveness and personality development.....	\$7,820
Empirical tests of a theory of interpersonal behavior.....	17,250
Alcohol used in a changing Navaho community.....	1,996
Juvenile delinquency in Japanese-American population.....	50,180
Studies of silent thinking.....	26,565
Behavior and physiological concomitants of dreaming.....	20,700
The social role of aging wild ungulate.....	8,205
The ontogeny of English phrase structure.....	2,100
A stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain.....	9,775
Blood groups genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos.....	11,500
Oral health of Icelandic peoples.....	14,030
Investigation of information contained in echoes.....	13,837
Studies of disease in a giant snail.....	20,092

Role of behavior of frontal monkeys..	\$15,998
Student culture and intellectual development.....	43,613
Travel of synthetic detergents with percolating water.....	20,991
Emergent leadership among the New Guinea Total.....	1,251
Mental age, IQ, sex, and divergent thinking.....	2,227
The establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony.....	13,816
A suicidal referral demonstration.....	100,215
Red tuna and yellow fat disease in the cat.....	19,965
Premarriage counseling.....	14,403
The skilled clinicians assessment of personality.....	94,587
Social space as bicomunication.....	21,616
Longitudinal growth studies on anomalies of the head.....	23,712
Appointment breaking in a pediatric clinic.....	18,000
Initiation and support of a colony of baboons.....	61,985

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 11, page 14286.

Sixth. The National Science Foundation, an independent agency of the Federal Government, has provided a total grant of \$78,000 to conduct turtle studies to find out what makes them tick.

Seventh. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awarded a \$80,700 1-year contract for research on dolphin talk to try to establish communications between dolphins and mankind—announcement made September 16, 1962.

Eighth. A grant of \$1¼ million was given for a 6-year study of the affectional relationship of an infant monkey and its mother—hearings, part 2, page 238.

Ninth. Ten thousand dollars was given for a tour of the U.S. defense plants by a Communist Polish official—brought over from Poland under educational and cultural exchange program by State Department in 1962.

Tenth. Air-conditioned Cadillacs eligible under aid program—hearings, part 2, page 414.

Eleventh. Plant explorers sent on a 30-month trip to the Kingdom of Nepal to look for specimens—particularly for those that are especially ornamental—Department of Agriculture announcement, September 17, 1962.

Twelfth. Foreign aid funds used in Kenya, Africa, for purchase of extra wives for government officials—hearings, part 2, page 289; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1962, House committee.

Thirteenth. Splendid new sports stadium built in an African country with primitive roads to get to it—statement by Eugene R. Black, World Bank President, September 18, 1962.

Fourteenth. A strikingly modern air terminal building constructed for a few planes while fertile land is left without irrigation in an African country—statement by Eugene R. Black, World Bank President, September 18, 1962.

Fifteenth. Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's roving Ambassador, spent \$600,000 on an 18-day jaunt around the world meeting ambassadors and their wives—hearings, part 2, page 60.

Sixteenth. U.S. Government is lending \$27 million to Ghana to build the Volta River Dam in addition to other loans. In questioning Secretary of State Dean Rusk during hearings, Representative JOSEPH MONTANA, Democrat, of New Mexico, asked:

Looking at the commitment on this loan in retrospect, what do you have to say in view of the fact that it has been disclosed there is in Ghana a school for the training of Communists—that was disclosed in the papers a few days ago, for the purpose of infiltrating into the different countries in Africa.

Secretary Rusk. I would not think that in itself would be grounds for not proceeding. There are other relationships between Ghana and Western countries in the military, educational, and technical assistance fields which we believe will serve in the longer run to be a very heavy counterbalance to the type of influence you just mentioned. We were playing also for the long-range political stakes in that country besides the economic stakes (hearings, pt. 2, p. 77); hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Seventeenth. Many Latin American countries have taken their dollars and have bought U.S. gold. Argentina, for instance, insisted on gold for dollars and in 1961 bought over \$150 million worth despite the fact that the United States was paying interest on the dollars. Many other countries are doing the same thing so that our deficit in the balance of payments and our gold reserves are at a dangerous level—hearings, part 2, page 122.

Eighteenth. An FHA aid, fired for gambling, is rehired by the Alliance for Progress and sent to Caracas, Venezuela, at a salary of \$17,030 per year—hearings, part 2, page 131.

Nineteenth. Greek Government appealed to its wheatgrowers to curb the growing of wheat to spur U.S. aid and then suggested the acreage be placed in cotton, competing with U.S. cotton—hearings, part 2, page 161.

Twentieth. Of the 24 countries sending delegates to the so-called neutral Belgrade Conference in September 1961, 23 are receiving U.S. economic assistance and 13, military assistance in fiscal year 1962. In fiscal year 1963, economic assistance is programed for 22 countries and military assistance for 13. Section 112 of last year's Appropriation Act stated:

It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those nations which share the view of the United States of the world crises.

Those words were almost exactly the same as those used by President Kennedy when he signed the authorization bill. Among the nations at that conference were Cuba, Ghana, Yugoslavia, Guinea, and Indonesia—hearings, part 2, page 206; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Twenty-first. No feasibility or engineering studies completed on many projects for foreign aid running into millions of dollars, yet not the smallest American flood control or drainage project would be authorized a penny until such plans

and costs were completed—hearings, part 2, page 230.

Twenty-second. Many foreign aid plans initiated by the United States, not by the recipient countries—hearings, part 2, page 237.

Twenty-third. Because of commitments made for foreign aid projects, Congress is losing control of aid program amounting to billions of dollars—hearings, part 2, page 264.

Twenty-fourth. Foreign funds spent to build superhighways in countries where there are few, if any, automobiles—hearings, part 2, page 288.

Twenty-fifth. A luxury yacht replete with air conditioning and gold wallpaper furnished a millionaire Emperor at the cost of \$3.1 million. Yacht called a training ship—hearings, part 2, page 329.

Twenty-sixth. Funds spent for troughs for camels—hearings, part 2, page 289.

Twenty-seventh. Funds spent for suits for Greek undertakers—hearings, part 2, page 289.

Twenty-eighth. Agreement between Morocco and the United States gives Morocco the U.S. bases worth millions of dollars by the end of 1963. One base now occupied by Russian personnel and Russian Mig planes. Yet we are substituting an aid program which according to the Under Secretary of State for African Affairs "would be judged like every other country"—hearings, part 2, pages 313 and 314; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Twenty-ninth. Teachers, claimed to be in short supply in the United States, are all over the world in the Peace Corps and in AID, some of them in the same buildings—hearings, part 2, pages 320 and 321.

Thirtieth. Southern Rhodesia has an agriculture school with 9 to 11 pupils as part of aid program and yet has 5 professors, more buildings than they can use, and everything else for a large school—hearings, part 2, page 326.

Thirty-first. Countries buying jet planes in Africa with aid money without proper facilities or business. Ghana has its own airline, all standing dead at the airport—hearings, part 2, page 327.

Thirty-second. In Liberia, independent since 1847, where there is a great deal of poverty and misery, a \$10 million palace is being built for the President despite the fact that the present palace practically equals the U.S. White House. Through fiscal year 1962, Liberia has received over \$40 million in foreign aid and around \$250 million for development loans—hearings, part 2, page 360.

Thirty-third. Three hundred and thirty thousand dollars spent for Libyan textbooks, refused by Libya because of its sensitiveness over American technicians editing them from French into Libyan texts—hearings, part 2, pages 398 and 444.

Thirty-fourth. Peace Corps made demands on air transport industry in letter to U.S. international carriers from Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, stating:

You are hereby instructed to file a tariff for Peace Corps personnel at 35 percent be-

low economy class fares—hearings, part 2, page 459.

Thirty-fifth. Contingency funds transferred for aid to countries. Even British possessions are considered for aid programs—hearings, part 2, page 468; hearings; foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Thirty-sixth. Household furnishings and other items under highway projects in Cameroon with average contract to technicians at \$30,000 each, at an average salary of \$12,000—hearings, part 2, pages 540.

Thirty-seventh. Ten million dollars loan to textile mill in Sudan; \$500,000 for textile mill in Ethiopia while our textile mills are suffering—hearings, part 2, page 701.

Thirty-eighth. New project for a survey of water supply system for the city of Libreville at cost of \$150,000 made without congressional approval—hearings, part 2, page 708.

Thirty-ninth. Increased funds for Kenya, a British possession, home of the Mau Mau, to \$3.2 million for fiscal year 1962—hearings, part 2, page 789.

Fortieth. No control can be exercised over the \$9 million of aid funds for Libya—hearings, part 2, page 837.

Forty-first. Two and one-half million dollars in aid for Mali with a very large element in the Government taking an anti-Western stand. Mali became independent in September 1960. It has 4.5 million people—hearings, part 2, page 845.

Forty-second. Nigeria, gaining independence October 1, 1960, from Great Britain, received a grant aid of \$20.5 million for 1962 in addition to U.S. loan commitments of \$225 million. Among projects is a TV educational program at a cost of \$343,000 for 1963 although Nigeria has only two TV stations and very few TV sets. Population is 36 million—hearings, part 2, pages 875 through 891.

Forty-third. For helping tourism in Tunisia there is an estimated obligation of \$167,000 for fiscal 1963. Communist bloc countries have extended over \$46 million in aid tied in with technical assistance and/or sale of capital goods—hearings, part 2, pages 951-952; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Forty-fourth. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for project for airline training for Tanganyika—hearings, part 2, page 975.

Forty-fifth. Two hundred thousand dollars allocated for a translation center in the African regional region together with an additional \$139,000 for translation services to translate African technical publications into French—hearings, part 2, page 982.

Forty-sixth. Cambodia given enough rifles so that each man had two rifles apiece—hearings, part 1, page 493.

Forty-seventh. Peace Corps has contract of \$59,000 with Institute for the Study of Man and another contract for experiment in international living for training of Peace Corps members—hearings, part 1, page 727.

Forty-eighth. Peace Corps men assigned as evaluators of other Peace



Corps men at an estimated cost of \$1 million—hearings, part 1, page 733.

Forty-ninth. Ten physical education directors assigned to Ivory Coast by Peace Corps—hearings, part 1, page 735.

Fiftieth. Peace Corps sent man, wife, and nine children to Philippines at a one-way cost of \$13,190. The man's salary is \$10,190. He is former executive secretary to the Newspaper Guild of Greater Boston and a Harvard graduate—hearings, pages 782, 783, 840, and 841.

Fifty-first. AID agency requested information from Library of Congress to compile and supply information to ascertain nations which have or have not received aid from the United States in order to answer questions by House Committee on Foreign Operations Appropriations—hearings, part 3, part 253; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Fifty-second. In Lebanon, at the stock breeding farm furnished by U.S. funds, there were nine stalls to each bull. Lebanon is one of the wealthiest countries in that area—hearings, part 3, page 278.

Fifty-third. Cyprus, which received \$679,000 in aid in 1962 from the United States bought up \$2 million of our gold at the end of 1961—hearings, part 3, page 375.

Fifty-fourth. India, which has received a total amount of about \$4 billion in U.S. aid is now negotiating to buy a Russian Mig aircraft plant—hearings, part 3, page 383.

Fifty-fifth. Iran, in the last quarter of 1961, purchased \$16.1 million of U.S. gold, yet that country is under the mutual security program for \$54.4 million exclusive of military aid—hearings, part 3, page 433.

Fifty-sixth. Iraq, which has, through fiscal year 1962, received a total of \$67.5 million in U.S. aid, bought a total of \$29.8 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 467.

Fifty-seventh. Request for \$225 million for Pakistan, for projects on which there are no commitments, has been programed for 1963—hearings, part 3, page 499.

Fifty-eighth. Cambodia, to whom we gave \$24 million in fiscal 1961, turned around and bought \$12 million worth of U.S. gold—hearings, part 3, page 556.

Fifty-ninth. Indonesia, to whom the United States gave \$44 million in aid in the last half of 1960, bought up \$24.9 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 607.

Sixtieth. Cambodian Highway, paid for by the United States, to cost—hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee—\$15 million, was so badly planned and built that it resulted in a cost of \$32 million and now must be further repaired at an additional cost of \$2.7 million—hearings, part 3, page 636.

Sixty-first. Vietnam, where our marines and other defense forces are fighting and dying, taxes U.S. goods received in that country as gifts. These are distributed in part to private businesses which sell them at a profit—hearings, part 3, page 684.

Sixty-second. Other nations with a system of taxing U.S. aid and selling it for a profit similar to Vietnam's are Cameroon, Guinea, Kenya, Morocco, Senegal, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Cambodia, Korea, Thailand, Greece, India, Israel, Pakistan, and Turkey—hearings, part 3, page 693.

Sixty-third. In Taiwan, Nationalist China, a sawmill was built in the mountains with U.S. aid; then it was learned it would not saw the type of logs produced there—hearings, part 4, page 714.

Sixty-fourth. AID is spending \$120,000 for an orientation course for employees going overseas, together with their wives and adult dependents—hearings, part 3, page 744.

Sixty-fifth. Fraudulent invoices from Laos for generators and sawmill equipment of \$207,500 were paid by the United States when actual cost was \$44,000. No recovery was made of the money expended. Laos also bought \$1.9 million of U.S. gold while taking \$24 million in aid for 1961—hearings, part 3, page 775.

Sixty-sixth. Four hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars granted by the United States to bring Japanese labor leaders to this country—hearings, part 3, page 811; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress long interested in American labor, it gives me pleasure to stand here today and say to the Department of Labor, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary—well done.

For labor, for Congress, indeed for all Americans, this is truly a golden occasion not only in time, but in terms of achievement. Congress passed the bill which created a separate Department of Labor half a century ago, on March 4, 1913. President Taft signed the bill and the one Department of the President's Cabinet which has as its sole concern people became a fact.

Working together, the legislative and executive branches of this Government have examined, been deeply concerned with, and worked hard to improve the welfare of the working force of America—those 70 million men and women who form the backbone of this country.

It is appropriate, therefore, to turn back the clock for a moment, and recall what working conditions were in 1913. I do not mean remember personally, mind you, I am having a 50th birthday myself this month. But perhaps that, too is symbolic. I am proud that labor has always been my own special concern. But we all know, of course, that

working conditions were far different in 1913 than they are today. Long hours of toil, wages not far above the subsistence level of living, unsafe, unhealthy sweatshops, child labor, little security—such, frequently, were the conditions of labor only 50 years ago. Weariness and fear were the daily companions of many a workingman—or the child that may have toiled beside him.

What has happened since, through the joint efforts of the Congress and the Department of Labor, and with the cooperation of both labor leaders and management, has been a continuing record of betterment for our working people. Child labor and immigration were among the major problems solved in the beginnings of the Labor Department. Social security, fair labor standards, minimum wage and hour specifications, unemployment insurance—these are only some of the benefits which have given Americans a better way of life.

Through two World Wars, the Department of Labor helped marshal a labor force ready to meet the production needs of the Nation. The National Employment Service helped in solving the problems of the depression period of the early 1930's. The Women's Bureau sought, and continues to work on, the status of women as a contributory factor in the economy, as more women than ever before are entering the ranks of labor. The Bureau of Labor Statistics furnishes us with data on the cost of living, family budgets, employment, and the occupational outlook—facts we must have at our fingertips in reviewing and anticipating trends in the economy of the Nation.

It has been a tremendously changing 50 years. It is gratifying to look at the working man and woman today and say, for the most part: their life is good. Both the Labor Department and Congress are to a large extent responsible for this march of human progress. It was not too long ago that unions were secret societies whose members had their names blacklisted by industry. Today, employees may negotiate freely.

But our problems are not all solved. The rush of automation in our new technology is setting a pace which the Labor Department and the Congress must equal and even anticipate, if the needs of the man and woman on the job are to be served. It is not an easy task.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which the Congress passed last summer is undertaking to train 400,000 persons in the next 3 years. The Area Redevelopment Act has translated into terms of action the concern for parts of the country where technological change must itself sponsor other changes. Fifty years ago we were just moving out of the horse-and-buggy age. Today, we are talking about why we cannot live on Venus. In such terms, we realize that although America has come a long way from the plantation life and industrial towns of colonial days, this country is still just laid out in the rough.

We are not going to forget the working people in all these changes. The Department of Labor and the Congress will see to that. People cannot be ignored merely

because machines are also more numerous. We faced other problems in the past. We will continue to do the same, in the same spirit, in the future.

It is often said that good things come in small packages. The Labor Department is the smallest branch of the President's Cabinet. But for tens of millions, it has certainly been a good thing. I have been proud to work with it and for it in its high goal of achieving the best for every man. In 50 years, we have come a long, long way.

#### SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPACT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to establish a Susquehanna River Basin compact between the States of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland.

Last year I requested that a comprehensive survey and report on the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin be undertaken, and this survey, which will take some 6 years to complete, is now underway by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my proposed measure is to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and other natural resources of the entire Susquehanna River Basin.

The establishment of such a compact would also provide for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, hydroelectric energy and public recreational facilities.

Some 15 million people at present live and work in the region of the Susquehanna River Basin and its environs which covers a geographic area in excess of 27,500 square miles, and the government, employment, industry, and economic development of the entire region and the health, safety, and general welfare of its population are and will continue to be vitally affected by the use, conservation, management, and control of the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin.

Demands upon the waters and related resources of the basin are expected to mount rapidly because of the anticipated increase in the population of the region projected to reach 23 million by 1980 and 33 million by the year 2010, and because of the anticipated increase in industrial growth projected to double by 1980.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest requires that facilities must be ready and

operative when needed to avoid the catastrophe of such things as unexpected floods or prolonged drought such as we experienced last summer.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will adopt this measure at an early date so the organization of this vital compact can be undertaken.

#### PLACING THE CUBAN CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we here on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate have been asked to partake of a smorgasbord of innuendo, misshapen facts, false alarms and all kinds of advice regarding foreign policy, particularly in respect to the Cuban situation.

On the right hand, we hear advice recommending that we should send forth a military expedition to unseat the regime of Fidel Castro. On the left hand, we hear advice that we should effect a reconciliation with the leftist Castro regime because it was driven leftward only because some unidentified capitalistic interests wished to do in the Cuban revolution in the first place. Both brands of advice seem unpalatable to me.

In the late 1930's and the early 1940's, the America First movement displayed its fare of disunion and distrust. Now apparently we have in our midst the "America last" critics. According to these critics, General de Gaulle is right, Chancellor Adenauer is right, Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker is right, every propertied Cuban emigree is right and every rumor ground from the plush, expense-account bar in Miami is right. According to these critics, President Kennedy is wrong, the entire intelligence-gathering apparatus of the U.S. Government is wrong and Defense Secretary McNamara is wrong.

It is human nature for fallible human beings to second-guess other human beings, particularly a President of the United States. President Kennedy sits today in the world's loneliest job in America, a welter of hair-raising problems—the thrust of Soviet imperialism, a nuclear arms race that threatens to destroy the world as we know it and maybe a few others.

President Kennedy not long ago replied with this stanza of poetry to his critics and at this point I quote it with approval:

Bullfight critics ranked in rows  
Crowd the enormous plaza full  
But only one is there who knows  
And he's the man who fights the bull.

I recall with a shudder the numbers game of the unsavory McCarthyite past. The numbers game in new dress today

revolves around Soviet facilities and men stationed in Cuba.

The numbers game is, of course, not new. Shakespeare has the following passage in *Othello* during a debate between the Duke of Venice and his council regarding the size of the enemy Turkish fleet.

DUKE. There is no composition in these news that gives them credit.

FIRST SENATOR. Indeed, they are disproportioned. My letters say a hundred and seven galleys.

DUKE. And mine, a hundred and forty.

SECOND SENATOR. And mine, two hundred.

Now in place of the Turkish fleet we are talking as I said earlier, about the Soviet presence in Cuba.

It would seem to me that any fair-minded critic would say that the recent extraordinary 2½-hour briefing of news correspondents by Defense Secretary McNamara and President Kennedy have placed the Cuban crisis in proper perspective.

The President is not saying that the United States is content to have alien military forces stationed in Cuba. The President, as I understand him, is saying that the nature of the Soviet presence is not of a nature to justify resort to military means at this time to expel it.

Mr. McNamara, the Defense Secretary, as I read the transcript of that press conference of his I mentioned earlier, has stated that the United States has the will and the means to discover in swift fashion potential use of defensive weapons in Cuba for offensive purposes.

We should, of course, look askance at the positioning of Soviet arms in Cuba. We should desire and work for their removal. We should encourage the establishment of a truly democratic administration in Cuba—but not the return to entrenched power and privilege of the Cuban counterparts, now in Florida, of the French Bourbons who in a statesman's cogent words: "Forgot nothing, forgave nothing."

Once again Cuba is an example of how we react with a military fixation to a problem whose largest element perhaps is nonmilitary in character. President Kennedy has stated this danger as being one of Cuba as a base for subversion in the Americas. He has also stated that time is short in which to bring about the social and economic reforms necessary to forestall brutish, totalitarian revolution in the developing countries of the Americas.

An essential fact is that frustration about Cuba is not new. Cuba has troubled us for some 150 years. This in itself should indicate that some quick solution is not available.

And that leads me to a collateral comment. There exists a myth that the Monroe Doctrine is some magic key to resolving difficulties. In the first place, Messrs. Monroe and Adams did not conceive of their policy as "doctrine"—the word was not employed until 1895 during Cleveland's second administration when Secretary of State Olney employed the



term. Nor did Messrs. Monroe and Adams ever speak of "enforcing" it—if it was enforced, it was enforced only by courtesy of the British Navy. Both recognized it could be enforced only in co-operation with another European nation—in this case, as I said, the British fleet.

In recent years the Monroe Doctrine has in fact been mutualized under the aegis of the Organization of American States which provides for consultation in any possible application of the policy.

I would also like to point out another historic parallel which has in the past gotten us in trouble—the use of the U.S. mainland as a base for operations for filibustering against Cuba and other nations. This began with such adventurers as Aaron Burr.

I think that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is to be commended for not playing politics with diplomacy. Diplomacy should not be conducted by means of Fourth of July oration papers.

Once again, there is no miracle tablet to cure our frustration in Cuba and in other troubled spots. There is the danger, too, of smaller nations or their self-appointed representatives playing one great power against another in frenzies of an excess.

President Kennedy has said that the Cuban problem must be dealt with as part of the larger worldwide issues. We should exercise the wisdom that the President has suggested and that he himself exercises. In an age of nuclear destruction, the charade of military might in the form of orations and saber rattling is indeed unforgivable and holds the most profound consequences.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce an editorial on the Cuban situation that appeared in the February 28, 1963, issue of the Portland, Oreg., Journal and a column by Art Buchwald that appeared in the March 3, 1963, editions of the Washington Post.

#### POLITICAL WAR OVER CUBA

When President Eisenhower was in office, and particularly during the 1960 campaign, the Journal criticized leading Democrats for partisan attacks on foreign policy of a kind that were damaging to this country.

Now it seems to us that some Republicans are guilty of the same thing over Cuba.

Cuba rightly is a foreign policy issue. Communist control of a country 90 miles from our shores is a serious matter. The presence of 17,000 Soviet troops and heavy supplies of Soviet military equipment is not to be taken lightly.

But the nature of the threat from Cuba ought to be kept clearly in mind. We see no possibility of an overt attack from Cuba on this country. We accept the proof offered by the Defense Department from its surveillance that Cuba does not possess missiles of the range needed to strike this country.

The chief value to Castro of Russian troops and materiel is to guard the Castro administration from an internal uprising by Cubans themselves or to defend against attack from abroad.

But the main thing we have to fear from Cuba is its use as a base for Communist revolution in the rest of Latin America. If Cuba is to remain a political issue, that ought to be the focal point of discussion.

The recent visit to Washington of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt is a reminder of this aspect of the Cuban threat.

Betancourt is convinced that Communist terrorism in his country is fomented and supported from Cuba.

If the Reds should succeed in destroying the moderate kind of government Betancourt has been trying to establish in Venezuela, after years of misrule by rightist dictatorship, then their threat to the rest of Latin America will have been multiplied. Communist control of Venezuela would be many times more dangerous than Communist control of Cuba. U.S. policy toward Latin America has to be a lot more comprehensive than simply getting the Russians out of Cuba.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has promised to withdraw thousands more of Soviet troops from Cuba. Nobody knows for certain that he means it. But there ought to be a moratorium on debate over this particular point until we see whether he fulfills his promise.

Some of the critics of our Cuba policy are not clear on what ought to be done. Few of them recommend that we invade the island. They simply say that we ought to do something.

Lots of things are being done. Time will be required to see whether they will accomplish the goal short of all-out nuclear war that nobody wants.

Meanwhile it helps to keep things in perspective if we remember that blame for Castro's rule can be widely shared. The bearded dictator came to power during the Eisenhower administration. He consolidated his position after Kennedy became President.

Everybody concedes that the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt was badly bungled. Nobody knows whether it would have led to Castro's overthrow even if it had been well planned and executed.

We think the debate on Cuba ought to be carried on more responsibly than it has been in recent weeks.

#### GETTING THE NEWS IS ALWAYS A BATTLE

(By Art Buchwald)

There has been a lot of talk about news management in the Government these days, but if you go through history you can find that every presidential administration tried to manage the press in one way or another. We found an old transcript the other day of a press briefing between Abraham Lincoln's press secretary and White House reporters, which shows that even in those days attempts were made to bottle up vital news of interest to the public.

Here are excerpts from it:

Question. Mr. Nicolay, yesterday the President gave a speech at Gettysburg, and he started it out by saying, "Four score and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation." Sir, would you mind telling us the names of the fathers he was referring to?

SECRETARY. I'm sorry, gentlemen. I can't reveal the names at this time.

Question. The Saturday Evening Post, which is published in Philadelphia, said he was referring to Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

SECRETARY. That's just conjecture. The President is not responsible for everything written by his friends.

Question. The President said yesterday in the same speech that the country was engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. He didn't say how he intended to win the war. Does this mean he has a no-win policy?

SECRETARY. The President in his speech was only concerned with the Battle of Gettysburg, which incidentally we won. The Department of War will give you full details on other battles.

Question. The Department refuses to give us any information. We don't know how many troops were used at Gettysburg, who

commanded them, or how many casualties there were. All we were given were some lousy photos of Confederate gun emplacements. How can we be sure the Confederates still don't have artillery hidden in the hills around Gettysburg?

SECRETARY. We have constant surveillance of the hills. To the best of our knowledge all southern artillery pieces have been removed.

Question. What about Confederate troops? There are an estimated 17,000 in the area.

SECRETARY. We have the South's promise they will be removed in due course.

Question. Mr. Secretary, why didn't Mrs. Lincoln go with the President to Gettysburg?

SECRETARY. Mrs. Lincoln feels that her place is at home with her children. But she did send a telegram.

Question. In talking about the government of the people, for the people, and by the people, did the President have any particular group in mind?

SECRETARY. Not to my knowledge, gentlemen. But I'll check it out just to make sure.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the President in his speech yesterday indicated he intended to manage the news.

SECRETARY. How did he do that?

Question. He said in the same speech, "The world will little note nor long remember what was said here." It seems to me in this phrase he was intimidating the newspapermen who were there.

SECRETARY. I don't think you have to interpret the speech in that manner. The President's remarks, written on an envelope, were off the cuff, and he felt there was no reason to be quoted. An official version of his speech will be made available to the press in due time, as soon as the President has a chance to go over it again.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNAWARE OF BENEFITS

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the "big heart" project of the Social Security Administration was publicized by Jerry Kluttz, Federal news reporter for the Washington Post, in the two articles appearing in the March 3 and 4, 1963, issues of that newspaper. It is always pleasing to read of private and public efforts that go beyond the bounds of duty. And it is particularly pleasing to read about these efforts of the social security agency which provides a margin of assistance to millions of low-income Americans. These articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

#### SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNAWARE OF BENEFITS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

A couple of weeks ago, on a chilly night, a vagrant crawled into a large trash can in downtown Baltimore and fell asleep.

The next morning, the man, who appeared in his 70's, was awakened when he was tossed into a 30-foot refuse pit.

A mechanical shovel was about to pick him up along with a pile of junk and throw

him into the city incinerator when a truck-driver saw the elderly man struggling in the debris and rescued him.

Bernard McKinley Jackson was taken before municipal court on a vagrancy charge. He said he had no money, no home, no job; and he asked to be placed where he could be looked after for awhile. The judge cooperated by sentencing him to 90 days in city jail.

But Jackson was better off than he had thought and his near tragic experience was a blessing in disguise. His story came to the attention of an employee in the sprawling headquarters of HEW's old-age and survivors insurance in the Woodlawn section of Baltimore.

The employee wondered if the vagrant was eligible for social security benefits. It took him only a matter of minutes to get a preliminary answer from OASI's stable of IBM electronic machines, the largest single number in operation anywhere.

The machines spit out 313,134 names of Jacksons, the 17th most popular surname in OASI's file of 140 million names. There were hundreds of Bernard Jacksons, but the robot revealed that only one Bernard McKinley Jackson was insured and eligible for benefits—and wasn't being paid them.

OASI investigators quickly confirmed that the penniless wanderer was the Bernard McKinley Jackson in their files. A claims expert visited Jackson in jail to explain that he should have been paid benefits for the past 9 years—since he became 65—if he had only applied for them.

Jackson signed the claim and he will receive \$520 in back benefits, the maximum he's entitled to under the law, and \$40 a month for the remainder of his life.

Unusual case? Not really. OASI has what is officially known as a leads program but which is also referred to as a "big heart" project to seek out aging persons who are eligible for social security benefits and to make payments to them.

Social security benefits are being paid monthly to 17 million men, women, and children and its rolls are growing at a rate of nearly a million annually. You'd think that anyone who pays into OASI's insurance fund would apply for benefits the minute he qualifies for them. But this isn't necessarily so.

To launch its "big heart" project, a few buttons were punched on the electronic machines and they served up the names of 1,156,000 insured persons who were over 65 and who had filed no claims for benefits.

A cross-section of 350,000 names were selected and they were sent to OASI's district offices which serve sections covered by the original addresses of the missing insured, many of them dating back 26 years when social security started.

As a result, more than 100,000 persons, many destitute like Jackson, are being paid benefits they had overlooked. OASI employees were unable to locate 191,086 of the 350,000 and the remainder weren't eligible for one reason or another.

OASI then took another batch of 240,000 names, persons it described as "less obviously insured," and sent them to its field offices along with what few clues it had on their possible whereabouts.

This program is in process now, and up to a few days ago agency employees set in motion machinery to pay benefits to 17,311 additional persons who were no doubt delighted with their windfalls.

The high degree of automation at OASI makes possible the "big heart" program. The machines may be cold and calculating but they also provide material for the human touch which an agency like social security can't afford to lose.

The machines, for example, keep Victor Christgau, OASI Director, supplied with the names and addresses of each person on the rolls who reaches age 100 and also the birthdays of the 412 recipients of social security who are more than 100 years of age. Christgau sends each of them happy birthday greetings. Incidentally, a dozen of the century oldsters are still actively employed.

#### OASI EMPLOYEES HAVE HIGH PRODUCTIVITY RATING

(By Jerry Klutetz)

Employees of HEW's old age and survivors insurance are cocky, confident and proud. They have good reason for their reassuring attitude.

They have one of the best work records in or out of Government. The President has publicly commended them on their efficiency. Administrative costs take only 2 cents of each dollar spent by OASI, a low figure. Employee turnover is lower than the average in either HEW or the entire Government.

Employee productivity is rising steadily, an estimated 5 percent this 1963 fiscal year and a gain of 2.8 percent is contemplated in fiscal year 1964. If production had continued at the 1962 level, about 2,900 additional employees and \$18.5 million in new funds would be required to operate the world's largest insurance system.

OASI pioneered the use of electronic data processing machines and its own experts helped to develop some of the most advanced and sophisticated IBM machines at its headquarters in the Woodlawn section on the outskirts of Baltimore.

Someone guessed it would take a million Federal employees to handle OASI's chores if there were no electronic machines to work their magic round the clock. Could be. Consider this: One machine can produce more work than 500,000 employees with desk calculators.

More than 18 million persons are paid monthly benefits and an average of 300,000 new claims for benefits are received each month. About 75 million persons work under social security and contribute to the OASI fund each year and 280 million earning reports, supplied by their employers, are recorded on their individual accounts.

The latter makes OASI the world's largest bookkeeper but it has no books to keep. The records are kept on tape and microfilm. The names and social security numbers of more than 140 million persons are maintained on 2,000 magazines of microfilm that can be stored in a single room.

The agency handles its duties with a 35,000-man staff of whom 10,000 are at its Baltimore headquarters, moved from Washington during World War II, and a goodly number of them commute from the Washington area.

OASI employees have no job worries. The agency has never had a layoff and its people are well aware that social security has overwhelming public and political support and is here to stay. Despite the giant machines that gobble up the work, the staff has had to be increased gradually to make effective the more liberal amendments voted to the social security law.

The employees are confident that one of these days, or years, Congress will give it another major task—to manage the proposed medicare program for the aged through social security.

If and when that happens, the headquarters building, the fifth largest in Government, would need to build another wing to house an estimated 3,000 new employees to manage it.

OASI has perhaps the most extensive program of preventive medicine for its 10,000

headquarters employees than any agency in Government. Dr. Leon Kochman heads a 31-man staff of doctors, nurses and technicians.

Physical exams are given every 3 years to employees under 40, every other year for those between 40 and 55, and annually for those over 55. Electrocardiograms are available to those 45 and older. A number of cases of cancer, tuberculosis and other diseases have been detected in their early stages by the tests. The employees are referred to their private physicians for treatment.

Chest X-rays, hearing tests and inoculations, for small fees, also are available to employees. The health office also keeps its own blood reservoir for the use of any employee and his family. The health office goes further and checks cafeteria employees who handle food even though they aren't employed by OASI but OASI employees are protected by this activity.

Only emergency treatment is administered by Dr. Kochman and his staff. Ailing employees must be treated by their private physicians who, Kochman stressed, have accepted the OASI program.

Perhaps one of the secrets of the splendid productivity record of OASI employees is the fact that they have a large voice in setting what is regarded as reasonable standards, or guidelines, for their work. Cardpunchers and other mechanical groups are given two 10-minute breaks daily, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon.

Sixty percent of OASI's employees are G-girls and women hold many of the key posts in the agency. Civil service's federal service entrance examination is most used by OASI which takes about 25 percent of all persons hired from the register. More than 5,000 employees have been hired from the FSEE during the past 2 years.

#### GABRIEL RICHARD, PRIEST, POLITICIAN, AND PATRIOT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago today marked the beginning of congressional service of Gabriel Richard, priest, politician, and patriot. He was elected as the Territorial Delegate to the 18th Congress of the United States from the Territory of Michigan. His term was to commence on March 4, 1823.

Representing the territorial wilderness of the Midwest, he had a wide and far vision for its future development. His prime interest was in the education of the people in the areas which he served and, as a priest, in ministering to their spiritual needs. These two objectives he performed with zeal and vigor.

His personage and his attributes have been highly respected, not only by the persons with whom he was in constant contact during his lifetime, but the tributes to his memory have followed down throughout the years to this date.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring out some facts on the life and priestly, political, and patriotic accomplishments of Father Gabriel Richard, a well-known individual in the annals of Michigan history.



GABRIEL RICHARD, PRIEST, POLITICIAN,  
AND PATRIOT

The city of Detroit has dedicated two public elementary schools in the name of Gabriel Richard. In 1936 Detroit created the Gabriel Richard Park overlooking the Detroit River at Belle Isle Bridge. In that park stands a statue of Father Richard paid for by popular subscription. In large measure these tributes to Gabriel Richard are due to the effort commenced almost 30 years ago by Msgr. Edward J. Hickey to bring to light the achievements of this remarkable son of France and pioneer citizen of early Detroit. By a ceremony held on June 7, 1948, a distinguished group of Detroit citizens celebrated the sesquicentennial of Father Richard's arrival in Detroit. It is appropriate that with the passing of the years another tribute be paid now to the memory of the only Catholic priest who served in the Congress of the United States.

Gabriel Richard was born on October 15, 1769, at La Ville de Saintes, France. He was the son of Francis Richard, a civil servant, and Genevieve Boussuet Richard. He was educated at the College of Saintes and the Sulpician seminaries at Augers and Issay. He was ordained a Sulpician priest on October 15, 1791, and remained to teach mathematics at Issay where he was associated with Benedict Joseph Flaget and Louis Du Bourg, both of whom later became Catholic bishops in the United States. He fled France during the Revolution, and arrived in Baltimore, Md., on June 24, 1792. It had been intended by the superior-general of his order that he serve at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, but his services were not needed at the small seminary, and he was assigned by Bishop John Carroll to work as a missionary among the French and Indians at Prairie du Rocher, Kaskaskia, and Cahokia. In the 6 years he spent in the Illinois country his zeal and courage were tested by frontier hardships, lack of companionship, the impetuosity of the Indians, the furies, and the settlers, and the danger of roving tribesmen. No missionary ever had a more difficult assignment. From the time of the departure of the Jesuits from the district a hundred years before, the French inhabitants of Illinois had been without pastoral care. Their intemperance and low morals had been a constant concern of Bishop Carroll's. Father Richard's outstanding success in this missionary venture led Bishop Carroll to appoint him to the pastorate of the Church of St. Anne in Detroit, and later to the vicariate of the entire territory of Michigan.

As vicar general Father Richard became an institution in the territory, a man of austere life, an eloquent preacher even in English, a reformer of commonsense, and a picturesque figure of sepulchral bearing marked by a livid scar, the result of a wound inflicted by a revolutionary mob as he made his escape from France. He ministered to the Indians of the whole area of Sault Saint Marie, Mackinac, Arbre Croche, Georgian Bay, and other fur posts. He compromised their difficulties, held French traders in check, and fought the evils of liquor. We shall say more later about his outstanding efforts in education.

In 1805 when Detroit was burned out he led relief work, and conducted services in a tent until he had rebuilt his church. In 1809 he obtained from Baltimore a printing press and a printer. On August 31, 1809, he published the first newspaper to appear in Detroit, the *Essai du Michigan ou Observateur Impartial*. Before the War of 1812 stopped his publishing activities, he had edited and published a children's spelling book, several devotional books, a volume of selections from the French poets, a Bible for Indians, and the laws of Michigan.

In addition to importing books and an organ from France, he imported carding machines, spinning wheels, and looms in an effort to stimulate local industry. He was a favorite among his own people and with the territorial officials as well. In 1807 he was asked by the governor of the territory and other officials to preach to them in English. Accordingly, on Sunday afternoons he met with his Protestant friends and preached to them of Christianity's truths.

Father Richard was a thoroughgoing American. During the War of 1812 he refused an oath to the King of England and was held by General Brock as a prisoner of war at Fort Malden near Sandwich until his release was demanded by Tecumseh. He is reputed to have prevented a massacre of prisoners through his influence with the Indians. On his return to Detroit he engaged in relief work among the destitute who had been impoverished by military and Indian raids.

The University of Michigan was established in 1817 by an act of the territorial Governor and judges dated August 26. Drawn up by Judge Augustus Brevoort Woodward, the law provided that 13 professorships, or courses, should be taught. The first, that of universal science, was to be taught by the president of the university. The Governor chose as president the Reverend John Monteith, a young Princeton graduate who had come to Detroit as a minister. He was also to teach six additional courses.

The Reverend Gabriel Richard was appointed to the second position in the university by the Governor. Father Richard was to teach 6 of the 13 courses. One of his courses was formidably described as "ennoeica, or intellectual sciences, embracing all the epistemim, or sciences relative to the minds of animals, to the human mind, to spiritual existences to the Deity, and to religion, the didactor, or professor of which shall be vice president of the institution."

Education was one of Father Richard's deepest interests. He opened a school in 1804 which was to prepare boys for entrance into the seminary in Baltimore. Classes were held in his rectory on St. Anne Street until the fire of 1805 completely destroyed the town.

Undiscouraged, Father Richard trained three young women as teachers and opened another school in 1806. In 1807 he established still another at Spring Hill, about 2 miles outside the town. To provide equipment for his schools, he purchased in the East electrical apparatus, looms, a printing press, and surveying instruments. Father Richard so impressed President Thomas Jefferson with his plans for training Indian children at the Spring Hill School that for several years he received a grant from the Government of the United States to assist in their education for life in the civilized community.

In 1808, petitioning the Governor and judges for funds, Father Richard reported that he had two English schools in Detroit, and, in addition, four primary schools for boys and two for girls at Spring Hill, the Grand Marais, and at the River Huron. His years of effort and experience in promoting education in Michigan eminently qualified Father Richard for a position on the faculty of the new university.

The university envisioned by Judge Woodward was to be more than an institution of higher learning. The act provided that it should have power to operate "colleges, academies, schools, libraries, museums, theatres, botanic gardens, laboratories, and other useful literary and scientific institutions—in, among, and throughout the various counties, cities, towns, townships, and other geographical divisions of Michigan." The university was to be supported by tax moneys.

Since at the time there were no students prepared to enter upon advanced studies, the founders of the university now organized a primary school and a classical academy in Detroit and erected a building to house them.

The Presbyterian minister and the Catholic priest cooperated cordially in managing the affairs of the new university. That they were friends whom differences of religious belief could not divide is shown by entries in the Reverend Monteith's diary. After calling on Father Richard, who was ill, the minister wrote "I think he loves to have me visit him." Another entry records the gift of a book from the priest; one of the books found in Reverend Monteith's collection bears the inscription on the flyleaf, "un present de M. G. Richard." It is one of the first books printed in Detroit, and it was printed on Father Richard's press.

On April 30, 1821, the territorial legislature passed an act which provided that the university should be governed by 21 trustees. Both Rev. John Monteith and Reverend Richard were made members of this board. The former left Detroit later in the year, but Father Richard served as a trustee until his death.

The University of Michigan today is the successor of the dream of Monteith and Richard in 1817. Its founding act designed an institution which was nonsectarian and supported by public funds, a public agency benefiting the people of Michigan. The University of Michigan has always been guided by the educational ideals which were loyally supported by its two clergymen founders.

Is it so surprising, then, that this man, beloved by many, should be elected the Territorial Delegate to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States? He entered the contest in order to serve better the interests of all the citizens of Michigan in their task of opening the West. It is also believed that he regarded the salary that he would receive as a means toward meeting the cost of the completion of construction of St. Anne's. Some of his own parishioners organized against him to vote for his opponent, John Biddle, brother of Nicholas Biddle, head of the Bank of the United States. Yet with the support of the majority of both his parishioners and non-parishioners he won the election to the 16th Congress. When he took his seat it was contested by John Biddle, but the House Committee on Elections upheld Father Richard.

His travels as a missionary had convinced Father Richard that there would be no westward progress of the United States unless roads were built through the wilderness. Therefore as a Delegate in the House he presented many petitions relating to lands and roads. One was for the construction of a road from Fort Meigs to Detroit, another for a post road from Mt. Clemens to Fultonville, another for roads through Detroit. His greatest service was his petition that a road be constructed from Detroit to Chicago, the great highway that today begins at Michigan Avenue in Detroit and ends at Michigan Avenue in Chicago.

In his January 28, 1825, speech to the House on his bill he foresaw the future greatness of his country:

"Everybody knows that the contemplated road is of the greatest importance, not only to the Territory of Michigan, but also to the general Government; and the consequence is, that it ought to be done immediately. This road will connect the East of the Union with the West. The grand Canal of New York will be completed next July. When the said Canal is finished, we consider Detroit in contact with New York. Last fall, I was on Lake St. Clair, on board a vessel built during the preceding winter, with a movable keel, ready and calculated to go

down, through Lake Erie and the whole of the Canal, to land at the battery in New York.

"In relation to our military operations, the utility of a road across the peninsula of Michigan, from Detroit to Chicago, is obvious. This road will afford a facility to transport munitions of war, provisions, and troops, to Chicago, Green Bay, Prairie du Chien, and St. Peter's River, et cetera. When our upper lakes are frozen, an easy communication will be constantly kept open, in sleighs, on the snow. Everybody knows that, during the last war, for want of a proper road across the Black Swamp, our Government incurred an expenditure of \$10 or \$12 million, which would have been avoided by having a good road, made in due time. Make this road now, when you have the full sovereignty over the territory of Michigan, before it becomes an independent State, and you may easily anticipate how beneficial this road will be to your finances. There are more than 17 million acres of, generally, good and fertile land, in Michigan proper (without speaking of the 94 million acres in the Northwest Territory.) Without a road to go to those lands, they have no value.

"We are credibly informed, that, on our inland seas, I mean Lakes Erie, St. Clair, Huron, and Michigan, no less than 150 vessels are plying up and down, on board of which whole families do come, sometimes, with their wagons, horses, sheep, and milk cows; land in Detroit, ready to go in search of good land, to settle on it, and having their money ready to give to the receiver of the land office. No road to go into that immense wilderness. What a disappointment. During about 12 months, last elapsed, more than \$100,000 have been actually paid into the hands of the receivers of public moneys, in the territory of Michigan, for land purchased. How much more would have been paid, if the proposed road had been made. We can learn from the commissioner of the general land office, that about 10 surveyors have been employed in surveying public lands in the interior of Michigan territory, between Detroit and Chicago, during last winter. These lands will soon be advertised to be sold. If there is no road to come to them, who will purchase them? But let this road be made; let it be determined by this House that it shall be made; then you will have purchasers enough: They will come as a torrent from the Eastern States. It cannot be questioned that the land along the intended road will sell for 200 or 300 percent more than it would if there were no such road; and so, in nearly the same proportion, the adjacent lands will be increased in price. If you ask me what will this road cost? I beg leave to answer, it will cost nothing to the Government. I might say it will cost less than nothing. The half of the land along the road only, will, after the road is made, or determined to be made, sell for a great deal more than the whole would, without the road. What an immense profit for your Treasury you can derive from the sale of this immense wilderness, which remains entirely unprofitable, if you have no road to come at it. This road is, therefore, to be beneficial to your finances, and your military operations, and to all parts of the Union, as well as to Michigan itself; as it will afford all kinds of encouragement to the citizens of the Eastern States, who wish to emigrate to the beautiful and fertile lands of the West."

The bill (H.R. 204) which he introduced was passed by the 18th Congress, and it was signed into law by the President on the last day of the second session of that Congress, March 3, 1825, the day that Father Richard's political career ended. He was defeated for reelection by not more than 70 votes.

From 1825 until his death in 1832 he continued as Vicar-General of the Territory. He

died of cholera on September 13. He had contracted the disease while trying to relieve the suffering of the sick during the plague of that year. He was buried in his beloved St. Anne's Church in Detroit.

"His death was a public calamity," said a contemporary. His body lay in state in the church which he had built. Members of the 1st Regiment of Michigan Militia returned to pay their respects to their chaplain. As the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep, so had he served his God, his people, and his country.

#### RATE ADJUSTMENT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today releasing a recent letter I received from Charles F. Luce, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, in reply to my letter of last January 28 concerning the need for an increase in the electric power rates charged by the BPA.

I am delighted to learn from Mr. Luce that he is committed to restoring BPA to the sound financial basis on which the agency was operated prior to 1957. It is gratifying to know that BPA plans to complete a general review of rates during the summer and fall of 1963 instead of waiting for the need of the statutory 5-year review period which comes late in 1964. Mr. Luce's decision to act this year is in accord with the recommendation I made to him last January.

Mr. Luce has indicated in his letter that BPA realizes that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964-69. This realization will be welcomed warmly by the taxpayers provided that the increase is sufficient to eliminate the drain which the BPA currently inflicts on taxpayers' funds. It occurs to me that Mr. Luce might consider seriously the possibility of increasing BPA rates where possible prior to December of 1964.

The suggestion was made by Mr. Luce that any BPA rate increase will depend in large part on congressional action on the proposed Federal transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest and on enactment of the so-called regional preference legislation. I hesitate to predict at this time how Congress will act on these two proposals, but I know Mr. Luce will agree that both pieces of legislation are quite controversial. It would be better, as I see it, for Mr. Luce to proceed to a determination as to BPA rates solely on the basis of the present situation rather than to wait indefinitely while Congress considers the course of action it will take on either or both of these two particularly controversial proposals.

I am somewhat disturbed by Mr. Luce's attempt to confuse the issue, in his letter to me, by equating BPA's interest rate with "the average cost of money to the U.S. Government." The data to which he refers cover the average in-

terest rate paid on all marketable short-term and long-term Treasury securities. If Mr. Luce had chosen what I regard as the more honest approach, he would have equated the BPA interest rate with the interest rates on long-term Treasury bonds. He would have found, according to the Treasury Bulletin for January of 1963, that the interest rate for such bonds has varied from 2.55 percent in 1954 to 4.08 percent in 1959. The average interest rate in 1962 was 3.95 percent.

Mr. Luce extended himself to some extent by reminding me that the colloquy in the Senate on August 9, 1937, between Senator ELLENDER and Senator STEIWER—81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8524—"clearly indicates that it was the understanding and intent of the Senate that rates be based upon generating capacity, and that if the full capacity was not sold the amortization period be extended rather than increasing the rates."

While this may be true, the colloquy to which Mr. Luce refers revolved around the question of whether there would be a sufficient market for BPA power and whether the quantity of power purchased would be enough to repay Federal costs. My reading of the remarks in the Senate that day do not lead me to conclude that the Senate intended then—nor does it intend now—to provide an artificial means of maintaining Bonneville's low power rates. I think Mr. Luce is eminently wise in avoiding use of an argument based on this colloquy in order to suggest a rate reduction for BPA or a delay in increasing Bonneville's rates.

I am most gratified that Mr. Luce has accepted my suggestion to study present Bonneville rates with the intention of increasing the rates in the near future to levels which reflect more accurately the costs which should be borne by BPA customers rather than by the taxpayers of the country as a whole. In my view the situation is serious enough to warrant immediate initiation of this rate study. Any delay, even into late summer or early fall of this year, can only make matters worse for BPA.

The text of Mr. Luce's letter of February 8, 1963, is attached.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,  
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1963.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: Thank you for your letter of January 28 concerning the possible need for an increase in Bonneville Power Administration rates.

We are committed to a program of putting Bonneville back on a solid financial basis, as it was until 1957. To the extent this requires an increase in our rates, that is what we will propose to the Federal Power Commission. In fact, 2 months ago we told our customers that we intend to complete a general review of BPA's rates in the summer and fall of 1963 and (as your letter recommends) not wait until the end of the present 5-year rate period which comes in December 1964. A month ago I publicly stated our intentions in this regard in an address before a meeting of the Allied Daily Newspaper Association of the State of Washington.



Although, because of surpluses accumulated prior to 1957, Bonneville is still cumulatively \$20 million ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to the Treasury; we realize that a rate increase may be required for the rate period 1964-69.

The amount of any BPA rate increase will depend in large part upon the reception which Congress gives our Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie program. An integral part of this program is the enactment of legislation defining our primary market area, as recently introduced in the House by Congressman HANSEN and Congressman WESTLAND. If the Congress this spring approves the program we have proposed, it should not be necessary to raise BPA rates enough to hurt electric consumers in our region. We estimate that our intertie program would net BPA between \$6 million and \$15 million per year.

Your letter refers to the House Public Works Appropriations hearings for 1962 in which we submitted data which showed BPA recent deficits would have been much greater had we been paying interest at 4 percent instead of 2½ percent. For those same hearings we also submitted data which showed that from 1939 through 1960 the average cost of money to the U.S. Government was only 2¼ percent and that Bonneville has been paying an interest rate higher than the average cost of money to the Government.

Your letter also refers to the Bonneville Project Act which requires amortization of projects over a reasonable period of time. The act also states that rates shall be set "upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities." At the time the act was passed in the Senate an amendment was offered to require amortization in 50 years, but this amendment was defeated. Further, the colloquy between Senators ELLENDER and STEIWER (81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8524) clearly indicates that it was the understanding and intent of the Senate that rates be based upon generating capacity, and that if the full capacity was not sold the amortization period be extended rather than increasing the rates. If we were to adopt the liberal approach to ratemaking permitted by the Bonneville Act, BPA would be considering a rate reduction instead of a rate increase, for in every deficit year unsold capacity has exceeded the amount of the deficit.

Over the years we have taken a more conservative approach to the problems of Bonneville rates and payout than the act itself contemplated.

We appreciate your keen interest in our fiscal problems. I hope that in the near future I will have an opportunity to discuss them further with you personally.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. LUCE,  
Administrator.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday, that the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PILCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CIX—217

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a revision in the program. It was previously announced that the resolution—House Resolution 228—would come up on Wednesday and the resolution—House Resolution 254—on Thursday. I take this time to advise after consulting with the minority leader and the chairman of the Committee on House Administration that if the resolution—House Resolution 228—which is a resolution to provide funds for investigation and studies by the Committee on Banking and Currency is finished expeditiously on Wednesday, then the resolution—House Resolution 254—which is a resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies for the Committee on Education and Labor might be called up also on Wednesday.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGOWN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for the week of March 4, 1963, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WRIGHT, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 6, 1963, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UTT.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. POWELL in two instances.

Mr. MORRIS.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

498. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the seventh annual report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, pursuant to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

499. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

500. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the first report on operations under title I and part A of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

501. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of improvident disposals of crane shovels and unnecessary procurement of outboard motors under a modernization program of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

502. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of manpower utilization in the maintenance of facilities and operation of utilities at selected military installations in Japan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

503. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

504. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

505. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft

of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

507. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with respect to certain civilian positions established pursuant to section 1581, title 10, United States Code, during calendar year 1962, pursuant to section 1582, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

508. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

509. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

510. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the manned aircraft nuclear propulsion program of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

511. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a supplemental report and certification of economic justification on the Crystal Dam, reservoir, and powerplant, which comprise a segment of the Curecanti Unit, Colorado River storage project, in Colorado (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4423. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4424. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4425. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4426. A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4427. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4428. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in

the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4432. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 4433. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4434. A bill to strengthen democratic processes within labor organizations respecting the calling of strikes, to protect union members against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of union members, to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce, and to promote the growth of the Nation's economy through reducing economic waste by providing for an impartial secret strike vote; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4435. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4436. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4437. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4439. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4440. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4441. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4442. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 4443. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital

and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4445. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4446. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments for jury duty shall be disregarded in the computation of income for purposes of payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4447. A bill to provide a new basis for determining the amount of money made available to a State for schools and roads by the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of sales of certain forest products from national forests located within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4448. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4449. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4450. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 4451. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4452. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, to implement the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4453. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Yuba River by the Yuba County Water Agency of Marysville, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD (by request):

H.R. 4454. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 4455. A bill to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect to use net operating losses only as carryovers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change certain dates prescribed for making declarations and installment payments of estimated income tax by individuals so that such payments will be due at regular 3-month intervals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.R. 4457. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate the existing authority to suspend the marking requirement with respect to sawed lumber and timber, certain poles of wood, and bundles of shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of a widow who has attained age 65, that gross income does not include gain from the sale or exchange of her residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4459. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4460. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4461. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, to provide for the payment of expenses of counsel assigned to indigent defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4462. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4463. A bill to prohibit the reproduction and reissuance of postage stamps found to be defective; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4464. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4465. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H.R. 4466. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to increase from 6½ to 6 percent the deduction from the basic salaries of employees generally for retirement; and to set 60 as the mandatory retirement age for certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4468. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4471. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 4472. A bill to exempt from compulsory coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of heart disease becoming disabling within 3 years after discharge; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4474. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4475. A bill to establish a National Service Corps to provide opportunities for dedicated American citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4476. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 4477. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4478. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4479. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4480. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4481. A bill to establish a research laboratory at which programs of research and study shall be conducted to develop new and improved industrial uses for dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4482. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the encouragement of invention by inventors and their employees, and thereby contribute to the advancement of the Nation's welfare, by providing for the administration in the public interest of the property rights to inventions resulting from research or development which is financed at least in part through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to increase from 6½ to 7½ percent the deduction from the basic salary of such employees for retirement; and to set 60 years as the mandatory retirement age for such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4485. A bill to guarantee electric consumers on the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4486. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4488. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to require approval by the Secretary of the Interior of highway projects before they can be constructed; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide additional deductions and exemptions for the expenses of medical care of persons 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 4490. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division. Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4491. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4492. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4493. A bill to extend for 4 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related natural resources of the Susquehanna River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat, and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to United Nations programs from being used for assistance to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal Sovereignty-treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action to the adoption of a United Nations' resolution calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the convening by the Secretary of the Interior of an international conference to initiate cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 275. Resolution favoring enactment by States of compulsory school attendance laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 276. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 277. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of the Panama Canal by vessels engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 278. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible

for reclamation development to meet the needs of today; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine proposing the abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the creation of a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all \$1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to local airline service to cities in California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give early consideration to the authorization and construction of the Challis project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending sincere appreciation and aloha to the Congress and the Department of the Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that land of the State of Indiana within 25 miles of Lake Michigan shall not be ceded or surrendered to the United States of America or any other sovereign power whose intentions do not coincide with the best interests of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging adoption and enactment of appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens presently borne by States and local governments as a result of numerous interstate residential changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to rejecting the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import control on foreign residual oil, and also to aid the domestic coal and oil industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to assuring that the funding requirements for the Pacific Northwest regional water pollution laboratory at Corvallis, Ore., receive adequate attention in the preparation of the budget for 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Karbis Balta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Severo and Cortese Severo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H.R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Matsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4497. A bill for the relief of Ruben A. Nepomuceno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4498. A bill for the relief of Miss Evelina Persello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4499. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angelos A. Kambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 4500. A bill for the relief of Melina Camello Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Arturo Longobardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH (by request):

H.R. 4505. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephina C. Aquino Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Devaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Francesco Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4509. A bill for the relief of Guy Fleming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luisa L. Burkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of William A. O'Dea and 33 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Mrs. Selby Love and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

59. Also, petition of Thomas N. Golden and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.



60. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Poulson and others, Grand Avenue Junior High School, Bellmore, Long Island, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the electoral college be nullified by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that it be replaced with a system utilizing the popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Alfred O. Fuerbringer, D.D., president, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

In the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal and almighty God, creator and preserver of the universe and all that it contains, ruler of all the peoples of the earth: Since Thou hast given us this good land for our heritage and dwelling place, we humbly ask Thee to guide us so that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favors and glad to do Thy will. Forgive, we implore Thee, our many shortcomings as individuals and as a nation. Purify our hearts to see and love the truth. Help us to overcome our inclination to selfishness and the prejudices which hinder the welfare of our fellow men.

Bless our land with sound learning, honorable industry, useful arts, and good manners. Save us from violence, discord, and strife. Keep us from pride, arrogance, and every evil way. Preserve our liberties and prosper our endeavors to fashion and keep as one united people the multitudes who claim this country as their own.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom all those to whom we have, in Thy name, entrusted the privilege and the responsibility of government, that they may plan and do what is right, and that justice and peace may be preserved throughout our land. Help us to observe Thy ways and to show forth Thy praise to all the nations of the earth. Teach us to be sincere in our dealings with our allies and our opponents, and incline the hearts of men everywhere to mutual confidence and to a genuine desire for equity and peace.

To Thy especial care we commend all those who are in suffering or want, who are deprived of their rights or their freedom, or who are in any kind of danger. Sustain them with Thy power, and deliver them by Thy might.

In the days of prosperity, fill our hearts with gratitude; and in time of trouble, do not let us lose our confidence in Thee and Thy sure help. All of this we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency cooperation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1963.

## REPORT ON ACTIVITIES CARRIED ON UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the seventeenth semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1963.

## CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on

the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

## NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## LABOR DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Trevor, of Maryland, to